The
Catholic Historical Review

VOLUME IV JULY, 1918 NUMBER 2

CATHOLIC EXPLORERS AND PIONEERS OF ILLINOIS

I

"After forty leagues on this same route [the Wisconsin], we reached the mouth of our river, and finding ourselves at 42½° N. we safely entered the Mississippi on the 17th of June (1673) with a joy that I cannot express."[1] First of all white men, Father Marquette, in company with the Sieur Jolliet and five more Frenchmen, discovered the mysterious river. He and his brother missionaries had heard wonderful accounts of it from the Illinois and Sioux tribes who came to trade with the French at the mission of La Pointe du St. Esprit on Lake Superior. The one wish uppermost in his heart for a long time was gratified at last. He had opened up a new empire for Christ and for his countrymen. In accordance with a promise made at the outset of his voyage, he gave the great waterway the name of "River of the Immaculate Conception."[2]

While the party floated down the gentle current in their two birch bark canoes, Marquette notes attentively all the peculiarities of this renowned stream and sketches them for us in that unadorned style so befitting the rugged primeval scenery. The flora and fauna, the mineral deposits and the fertile prairie—nothing escaped his trained eye. "Proceeding south and southwest, we find ourselves at 41° north, then at 40° and some minutes,

[1] J. G. SHEA, *Discovery and Exploration of the Miss. Valley*, p. 16. Although the Spaniards may have known the river, the most diligent research has failed to bring to light any documents attesting beyond doubt that they explored it to any extent. For a status of the controversy, see: SHEA, *op. cit.*, p. 7; PARKMAN, *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West*, p. 3*ff*.

[2] SHEA, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

partly by southeast and partly by southwest, after having advanced more than sixty leagues since entering the river without discovering anything. At last, on the 25th of June we perceived footprints of men by the waterside and a beaten path entering a beautiful prairie. Mr. Jolliet and I followed the little path in silence and having advanced about two leagues, we discovered a village on the banks of the river, and two others on a hill, half a league from the former. Then, indeed, we recommended ourselves to God with all our hearts, and having implored his help, we passed on undiscovered and came so near that we even heard the Indians talking. We then deemed it time to announce ourselves as we did by a cry which we raised with all our strength, and then halted without advancing any further. At this cry the Indians rushed out of their cabins, and having probably recognized us as French, especially seeing a black gown, they deputed four old men to come and speak with us—I spoke to them first and asked them who they were. They answered that they were *Illinois*, and in token of peace they presented their pipes to smoke. They then invited us to their village, where all the tribe awaited us with impatience."[3]

At the door of the cabin in which they were to be received stood an old man. When they came near him he paid them this compliment: "How beautiful is the sun, O Frenchman, when thou comest to visit us! All our town awaits thee, and thou shalt enter all our cabins in peace." He then took them into his, where there was a crowd of people who devoured the strangers with their eyes but kept a profound silence. They heard, however, these words occasionally addressed to them: "Well done, brothers, to visit us."

At the northern trading posts the Illinois had expressly invited Marquette to visit them. Now he was with them in their native habitat. Complacently he goes on to describe his reception, the flowery Indian speeches of welcome, the feasts at which "the master of ceremonies presented a spoonful of sagamity three or four times to my mouth as we would do with a child;" their calumet dance, their language.[4] And his account is flattering. "To say

[3] Shea, *op. cit.*, pp. 20–22.
[4] Shea, *op. cit.*, pp. 22–24.

'Illinois' is in their language to say 'the men,' as if other Indians compared to them were mere beasts. And it must be admitted that they have an air of humanity that we had not remarked in the other nations that we had seen on the way."[5] The travelers slept in the sachem's cabin, and the next day they took leave of him, promising to pass back through his town in four moons. Marquette added that he would return the next year to stay with them and instruct them in the faith.

Tarrying no longer, the voyagers pursued their course southward as far as the mouth of the Arkansas. By this time there was no longer any doubt that the Mississippi emptied, not into "the Virginia Sea," nor into the "Red Sea" and the Pacific, but into the Gulf of Mexico. The great object of their adventurous trip had been attained. Fearing to fall into the hands of the Spaniards whom they knew not to be far off, they retraced their steps. On the 17th of July they began to reascend the river, which gave them great trouble in stemming its current. But instead of taking their original route to the northward, they left the Mississippi to enter the Illinois river, which greatly shortened their way and brought them with little trouble to the "Lake of the Illinois."[6] "We had seen nothing like this river for the fertility of the land, its prairies, woods, wild cattle, stags, deer, wild cats, bustards, swans, ducks, parrots, and even beaver; its many little lakes and rivers. That on which we sailed is broad, deep and gentle for 65 leagues . . . We found there an Illinois town called Kaskaskia, composed of seventy-four cabins. They received us well and compelled me to promise to return and instruct them. One of the chiefs of this tribe with the young men escorted us to the Illinois lake, whence at last we returned at the close of September to the bay of the Fetid [Green Bay] whence we had set out in the beginning of June. Had all this voyage caused but the salvation of a single soul, I should deem all my fatigue well repaid. And this I have reason to think, for when I was returning, I passed by the Indians of Peoria. I was

[5] SHEA, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

[6] The present Lake Michigan was called by this earlier name, not after the Illinois tribe of Indians who never lived on its shores, but probably because through it lay the direct route to the Illinois villages which Father Marquette was now the first to visit.

three days announcing the faith in all their cabins, after which, as we were embarking, they brought me to the water's edge a dying child which I baptized a little before it expired by an admirable Providence for the salvation of that innocent soul."[7]

The long trip of fully 2,700 miles had overtaxed Marquette's strength and he was detained for a whole year at the mission of St. Francis Xavier, Green Bay. In September, 1674, he had sufficiently recovered to enable him to keep his promise to the Illinois. Having drawn up and sent to his superiors copies of his journal down the Mississippi,[8] he set out on October 25. Slowly his party advanced by land and by water, frequently arrested by the state of Lake Michigan. On November 23, he was again seized with his old malady, but he pushed on and by December 4, had reached the Chicago river. Intending to portage from there to the Illinois he was forced to winter at the portage, and his journal, published for the first time by Shea,[9] gives us a vivid glimpse of the explorer's hardihood and the missionary's undaunted courage. Despairing of human remedies, he began a novena to the Blessed Virgin. His strength returned and on the 25th of March, 1675, he set out again on his long interrupted voyage. On the 8th of April he reached the town of the Indians on the Illinois and began his work of evangelization in earnest. On Holy Thursday he said Mass and then again on Easter Sunday, and by these two sacred rites, the first ever offered up to God on the soil of Illinois, he took possession of all that country in the name of Jesus Christ and gave his mission the name of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin.[10] Compelled to leave, he desired to die amid his brethren at Michilimackinac and tried to reach it by following the eastern, to him unknown, shore of Lake Michigan. His strength was spent, and he died in the wilderness on May 18, 1675.[11]

But his work did not die with him. The white man's labor

---

[7] SHEA, *op. cit.*, pp. 51, 52.

[8] The Sieur Jolliet had already left for Canada with his maps and a detailed log of their trip down the river. But all his papers were lost when he suffered shipwreck on the St. Lawrence. Hence the great historical value attaching to Fr. Marquette's recital, the only one in existence.

[9] *Op. cit.*, pp. 258*ff*.

[10] SHEA, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

[11] *Op. cit.*, p. xxi.

in Illinois had just begun. Father Allouez soon took up the burden. He embarked about the close of October, 1676, in a canoe with two men to endeavor to go and winter with the Illinois. But the ice stopped him, and it was only in April, 1677, that he reached his destination and found himself a most welcome visitor among the Kaskaskias,[12] the Illinois tribe already visited by Marquette. They had gathered around them seven more tribes from the surrounding territory. He had little time to remain, having come mainly to acquire the necessary information for the establishment of a permanent mission. He baptized thirty-five children and one sick adult, who soon after died with one of the infants "to go and take possession of heaven in the name of the whole nation. And we, too, to take possession of these tribes in the name of Jesus Christ, on the third of May, the feast of the Holy Cross, erected in the midst of the town a cross 25 feet high, chanting the *Vexilla Regis* in the presence of a great number of Illinois of all tribes, of whom I can say in truth that they did not take Jesus Christ Crucified for a folly nor for a scandal; on the contrary, they witnessed the ceremony with great respect and heard all that I said on the mystery with great admiration. The children even went to kiss the cross through devotion and the old earnestly commended me to place it well so that it would not fall."

Leaving the tribes for a short while, he returned in 1678. But it was bruited about that a new explorer was on his way to the Illinois country, a man rather prejudiced against Allouez and whom the latter did not wish to meet. He retired from his mission, visiting it only at intervals up to 1689, the year in which he probably died.[13]

---

[12] SHEA, *op. cit.*, p. 74 note, judging from the latitude given by Allouez, thinks they must have been established near "Rockfort." Identification of the site would be difficult had not later investigations shown that they must have dwelt near "Rock Fort," the later Fort St. Louis of La Salle or the present "Starved Rock." OSMAN, *Starved Rock*, p. 194. The tribe figures quite largely in subsequent Illinois history, and was, in common with other Indian tribes, of migratory habits. Fr. Membré (SHEA, *op. cit.*, p. 150) in 1680 places them above the river Checagoumemant or Chicago. Later on we find them definitely settled on the Mississippi, in southern Illinois, where they gave their name to a village that was for a time the capital of Illinois.

[13] SHEA, *op. cit.*, p. 70 note.

The much heralded and hardy explorer whom Allouez feared was none other than his countryman, Robert Cavelier de la Salle, to whom Illinois is indebted for its first regularly established colonies of white men.

With him also came other missionaries, the Recollects, to take the place of the Jesuits, whom La Salle unjustly accused of dark intrigues to ruin his projects.[14] At this point a new era opens in the history of Illinois and the whole Mississippi valley. Coureurs de bois, whites and half breeds, had traversed the country back and forth, bent only on profitable trade with the Indians and leaving no records behind them. But now an organized attempt was set on foot, with the support of the home government, to evangelize, civilize and settle the vast western lands for the benefit of France. It speaks volumes for the spirit of daring adventure and enterprise of the French that they should contemplate and carry to conclusion this stupendous enterprise. And circumstances favored them. In the opening of the North American continent the Frenchman had this great advantage over some of his rivals, that he entered the land from the right direction and at a very strategic point. The first important expedition which the French sent out to the New World, that of Jacques Cartier in 1534, brought them at once to the mouth of the St. Lawrence and set them on the most inviting part of the vast interior. As a consequence of this, and of the further fact that by nature the Frenchmen who came to America were of a more roving disposition than the English, their explorations moved much more rapidly. They covered the ground a score of times and had ranged and mapped the country continuously from Labrador to the Gulf of Mexico, before the English yet knew the upper course of the St. James, the Hudson and the Connecticut.[15]

La Salle's projects were of truly imperial scope. Armed with letters patent from Louis XIV, king of France, he set out from Fort Frontenac on the St. Lawrence in 1678. Pushing on with iron determination, he was soon on the Niagara river, where his first vessel, the *Griffin*, was launched in August, 1679. He destined it for the Lakes' trade. With him were the Flemish

[14] PARKMAN, *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West*, p. 238 note. For a fine sketch of the explorer's character, see *ibid*, p. 480.

[15] F. A. OGG, *The Opening of the Mississippi*, pp. 183–184.

Recollect friars: Louis Hennepin, Gabriel de la Ribourde, Melithon Watteau, Zenobius Membré. Father Hennepin had recently discovered Niagara Falls, the first white man to behold them in all their pristine glory. Greater work was in store for this hardy pioneer. La Salle's company also included the faithful Henry de Tonty who was to distinguish himself on many occasions, besides carpenters, blacksmiths and other tradesmen. On the Illinois river he intended to build another craft for trade on these waters.

Setting out from Michilimackinac, La Salle came down the western shore of the lake and skirted its southern extremity to the St. Joseph river, where Tonty and his party were to join him by descending the eastern shore. They met in November. On December 3, they embarked, thirty-three in all, in eight canoes, and there ascended the St. Joseph. On approaching the site of the present city of South Bend, they looked anxiously on the shore on their right to find the portage leading to the headwaters of the Illinois. With the help of a Mohigan Indian in the party it was found, and shouldering their canoes and baggage, they traveled five miles over oozy soil to the Kankakee river. Soon they were once more afloat, and found themselves drifting into the Seignelay or Illinois. The prairies, stretching far and wide, looked bleak and desolate; but they gave evidence of supporting immense herds of buffalo whose skins were to afford La Salle the wherewithal to continue his explorations. Starved Rock, steep and forbidding, towered along the left bank, while on the right was the great Illinois village where Father Marquette had preached in 1675. The camp was lifeless, since the inhabitants had not returned from their winter hunting. La Salle's party was short of food, and at the risk of incurring the wrath of the Indians, they opened their caches of corn, helping themselves to whatever they needed, and leaving presents instead. Thus secured against famine, they set out once more on their downward journey.

On New Year's Day, 1680, they landed and heard Mass said by Father Hennepin, who addressed the men, exhorting them to patience, faith and constancy. On January 5, they reached the long expansion of the river called Pimiteoui or Peoria Lake and leisurely made their way to the site of the present city of Peoria. A trail of smoke betokened the presence of Indians. The shores

approached each other, and the Illinois was once more a river. At 9 o'clock the next morning, doubling a point, La Salle saw about eighty Illinois wigwams on both banks. The Indians were ready to swoop down upon the intruders, but La Salle at the head of a few armed men made a daring sally right in their midst which brought forth the calumet of peace. Food was placed before them, and, as the Illinois code of courtesy enjoined, their entertainers conveyed the morsels with their own hands to the lips of the unenviable victims of their hospitality, while others rubbed their feet with bear's grease. La Salle promised to defend them against their deadly enemies, the Iroquois, if they would allow him to build a post among them and a great wooden canoe to descend the Mississippi to the sea and bring them the goods they wanted and needed. The Illinois were well disposed, but Indian intriguers from other camps appeared during the night to undo his work, and so terrified became some of his men at the risk they faced in the wilderness that they deserted under cover of darkness.[16]

La Salle now resolved to leave the Indian camp to fortify himself for the winter in a strong position. About the middle of January a thaw broke up the ice and, together with Hennepin, he set out in a canoe to visit the site he had chosen for his projected fort. It was half a league below the Indian camp, on a knoll 200 yards from the southern bank. On either side was a deep ravine, and in front a marshy tract overflowed at high water. Under his direction his men dug a ditch behind the hill connecting the two ravines and thus completely isolating it. An embankment of earth was thrown up on every side while a palisade twenty-five feet high was planted around the whole. The lodgings of the men were at two of the angles; the house of the friars, Hennepin, Ribourde, Membré, at the third; the forge and magazine at the fourth, and the tents of La Salle and Tonty in the area within. Father Hennepin laments the failure of wine which prevented him from saying Mass, but every morning and evening he gathered the men in his cabin for prayers and preaching, and on Sundays and festivals they chanted vespers. Father Membré usually spent his days in the Indian camp striving to win them to the faith and

[16] PARKMAN, *La Salle*, p. 172.

to overcome the disgust with which their manners and habits inspired him.[17]

Such was the first white occupation of the region which now forms the state of Illinois. La Salle christened the new fort Fort Crêvecœur. The name tells of disaster and suffering in the past and was prophetic of the future. But nothing could ever daunt the iron-hearted constancy of the sufferer. The ship he had set out to build at Fort Crêvecœur could not be finished. Of his Niagara vessel, the *Griffin*, he received no tidings. Harassed by anxieties and by his creditors, he resolved on a trip to Montreal in the middle of the winter. He set out, and in sixty-five days he traveled over 1,000 miles, truly "the most arduous trip ever made by Frenchmen in America."[18] Before leaving, he had ordered Father Hennepin to explore the Illinois to the Mississippi,[19] thus to prepare the way for him. Hennepin left Fort Crêvecœur where the hardy and faithful Tonty remained as commander, on February 29, 1680. He arrived at the mouth of the river about March 8. Leaving on March 12, he canoed up the Mississippi, whose northern course he was the first white man to explore, as far as the Falls of St. Anthony. Taken a prisoner by the Sioux on April 11, he underwent great hardships and was in constant danger of his life. Rescued by Duluth in July, 1681, he proceeded to Montreal and to Europe, never to return.[20]

The vicissitudes of the two other missionary priests in the party are thus detailed by Father Membré: "From our arrival at Fort Crêvecœur on the 14th of January, Father Gabriel, our superior, Father Louis and myself had raised a cabin in which we had established some little regularity, exercising our functions as missionaries to the French of our party and to the Illinois Indians

[17] His narrative is given in SHEA, *op. cit.*, p. 147*ff*. The first impression which the missionaries received on coming in contact with the Illinois was very favorable, as Father Marquette testifies. But on closer acquaintance it underwent a great change: Fr. Membré, in SHEA, p. 15. Unflagging zeal overcame all obstacles and after a few years Christianity found in them submissive subjects. Father Marest, writing in 1712 (SHEA, *op. cit.*, note, p. 25) has nothing but praise for them. The labor and devotion that produced these results can only be imagined.

[18] PARKMAN, p. 189.

[19] SHEA, pp. 107*ff*.

[20] Fr. Hennepin published a twofold account of his explorations and adventures; one in 1684 and one in 1697. The latter was also published in England in 1699. He has been mercilessly attacked and exposed by all historians for his untruthfulness and dishonest literary methods. SHEA, pp. 99*ff*; PARKMAN, pp. 242*ff*.

who came in crowds. As by the end of February, I already knew a part of their language, because I spent the whole of the day in the Indian camp which was but half a league off, our father superior appointed me to follow them when they were about to return to their village. A chief named Oumahouha had adopted me as his son in the Indian fashion, and Mr. de la Salle had made him presents to take care of me. Father Gabriel resolved to stay at the fort with the Sieur de Tonty and the workmen. This had also been the request of the Sieur de la Salle, who hoped that by his credit and the apparent confidence of the people in him he would be able to keep them in order. But God permitted that the good intentions in which the Sieur de la Salle left them should not last long."[21]

Indeed, shortly after La Salle's and Hennepin's departure nearly all the men at Fort Crêvecœur mutinied and deserted, plundering the magazine and throwing into the river all the arms, goods and stores which they could not carry off. The space of three months saw the beginning and the end of the first white colony in Illinois.[22]

---

[21] SHEA, *op. cit.*, p. 149.

[22] PARKMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 199, says they destroyed the fort. But Fr. Membré makes no mention of this when relating the incident of their desertion, and later on he expressly states that they found it intact on their return; SHEA, p. 166. Fort Crêvecœur, however, seems to have played no further rôle of importance in Illinois history. In the later letters of missionaries mention is made several times of "the fort." In his edition of the *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, Dr. Thwaites notes that "Fort Crêvecœur" is meant: Vol. lxiv, pp. 161, 201, 203; also Vol. lxvi, p. 287, in a letter of Fr. Marest, November, 1712. But the description of Fr. Marest makes it clear that he means "Fort St. Louis" built by La Salle and Tonty farther to the north in December, 1682. Fr. Marest tells us that he came by way of the St. Joseph river, portaging from there to the Kankakee: "The Peoria savages came some leagues to meet me. When I drew near the village, the greater part of the men ascended to the *Fort which is placed upon a rock on the bank of the river.*" That can be true only of Fort St. Louis. Father Marest also mentions that he gathered the Indians together in the chapel "outside the fort." There was a chapel outside of Fort St. Louis, but there was none at Fort Crêvecœur. OSMAN, *Starved Rock*, p. 139. Confusion with regard to these two forts of La Salle seems to have originated very early. Franquelin's famous map of 1684 shows in detail the "Colonie du Sieur de la Salle," but only Fort St. Louis is indicated thereon. (PARKMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 315.) His map of 1688 shows also Fort Crêvecœur. Popples' map, undated, in the British Museum, made about the year 1700, shows Fort St. Louis and Fort Crêvecœur *at the same place.* An old French Official Map, in the British Museum, dated 1718, has: Fort Louis, appelé cy devant Fort Crêvecœur. On Tillman's map, 1688, only Fort de Crêvecœur is given. Copies of these maps may be found in: J. F. STEWARD, *Lost Maramech and Earliest Chicago*, 1903.

Father Ribourde and Henry de Tonty followed Father Membré to the great Illinois village, where in September, 1680, took place one of the fiercest dramas of savage warfare ever witnessed on Illinois territory. The bloodthirsty Iroquois, instigated by Dutch and English traders in the east who wished them to get a monopoly in the western fur country, wreaked an awful vengeance on the Illinois, destroying all they found and venting even their insatiable fury on the interred bodies of the tribe's dead.[23] Seeing themselves abandoned by the terror-stricken and fleeing Illinois, Tonty, the two fathers and their handful of men, "left alone, exposed to the fury of a savage and victorious enemy, were not long in resolving to retreat." They began their march on September 18, without provisions, food or anything, in a wretched bark canoe, which, breaking the next day, compelled them to land about noon to repair it. "Father Gabriel, seeing the place of our landing fit for walking in the prairies and hills with little groves as if planted by hand, retired to say his breviary while we were working at the canoe all the rest of that day. We were full eight leagues from the village ascending the river. Toward evening I went to look for the father, seeing that he did not return; all our party did the same. We fired repeatedly to direct him, but in vain." He had been murdered by some roving Kickapoo braves, who carried off his scalp. On September 19, 1680, the first martyr of the faith was killed on Illinois soil, and Father Membré pays him a simple but fitting and heartfelt tribute.[24] The little party of white men fled as fast as circumstances permitted. "I made shoes for my companions and myself of Father Gabriel's cloak," notes Father Membré,[25] and they supported the remnant of a languishing life by potatoes and garlick and other roots that they found by scraping the ground with their fingers. After thirty-four days of starvation they arrived at Green Bay, where the Jesuits received them kindly and kept them through the winter.

La Salle had returned in the meantime, found the great Illinois village in ruins and gone north to spend the winter on the St. Joseph. In the spring he traveled to Mackinack, where Membré joined him, and together they traveled to Fort Fron-

[23] See details in SHEA, *op. cit.*, *Membré's Narrative*, pp. 154*ff*; also PARKMAN, p. 217.
[24] SHEA, pp. 158–159.
[25] SHEA, p. 159.

tenac. Thence they set out shortly, La Salle more determined than ever to explore the Mississippi to the gulf. On November 3, 1681, they were once more on the St. Joseph river, a party of fifty-four persons, including ten Indian squaws and three children. Membré and Tonty were detached with some men to skirt Lake Dauphin (Michigan), to go to "the divine river, called by the Indians, Checagou,[26] to make necessary arrangements for the voyage. Once more they were on Illinois soil where so many disappointments had fallen to their lot. On December 27, they made a portage to the Illinois river with the help of sleighs. They had to drag their canoes and baggage 80 leagues on the river ice. Traversing the great Illinois town, they found it empty, the inhabitants having gone to winter 30 leagues lower down on Lake Pimiteoui (Peoria), where Fort Crêvecœur was found in good state. From here on they found navigation open. Embarking in their canoes, they reached the mouth of the river on February 6. The floating ice on the Mississippi kept them at this place until February 13, when they set out again, reaching the Gulf at last on April 9, 1682. "With all possible solemnity," relates Father Membré, the only one of the original band of missionaries to share to the end in the glorious quest, "we performed the ceremony of planting the cross and raising the arms of France. After we had chanted the hymn of the Church: *Vexilla Regis*, and the *Te Deum*, the Sieur de la Salle, in the name of His Majesty, took possession of that river, of all the rivers that enter it, and all the country watered by them."[27] A truly imperial domain, christened Louisiana and containing about a million and a quarter square miles! Yet Louis XIV, when the matter had been reported to him, wrote to Fontainebleau, his governor in Canada: "I am convinced that the discovery of the Sieur de la Salle is very useless, and that such enterprises ought to be prevented in the future, as they tend only to debauch the inhabitants by the hope of gain, and to diminish the revenue from beaver skins!"[28]

[26] PARKMAN, p. 167, note, says that the "Kankakee" was called also the "divine river" and that the name was applied at times to the whole course of the Illinois. Membré (SHEA, p. 166) expressly states that the name "divine river" was given to a stream called by the Indians "Checagou." The origin and meaning of the French name, Rivière de la Divine, has thus far not been accounted for.

[27] SHEA, p. 174.

[28] OGG, *op. cit.*, p. 324.

La Salle had found the much desired outlet for his ambitious colonial enterprise that was to center in the Illinois country. Thither he intended to return at once since food was very scarce. Father Membré graphically describes their plight: "We were out of provision and food and found only some dried meat at the mouth (of the river) which we took to appease our hunger; but soon after, perceiving it to be *human flesh*, we left the rest to our Indians. *It was very good and delicate!*"[29]

The day after the solemn "prise de possession," on April 10, they began to remount the river, living only on potatoes and crocodiles (alligators). La Salle was taken dangerously ill 100 leagues below the mouth of the Illinois river, and Father Membré attended him. Tonty in the meanwhile was despatched to the Illinois to set everything in order there for a new colony. At the end of July, La Salle was once more able to travel by slow journeys, and at the end of September, 1682, he was back on the St. Joseph river. A report reached him that the Iroquois were once more on the warpath, and he hastened to rejoin Tonty on the Illinois, on the site of the great town wiped out by them shortly before. Starved Rock was chosen as the easiest place to fortify against the inroads of the savages and there in the month of December, La Salle and Tonty began to intrench themselves, calling it Fort St. Louis. The trees were cut down and the timber used for storehouses and dwellings and a chapel, while the whole was encircled with palisades. On the open prairie stretching on all sides, a concourse of Indians of all tribes soon gathered, and La Salle, in a report to the Minister of the Marine, puts their number at 4,000 warriors or about 20,000 souls. A small number of whites received grants of land to cultivate around the fort, and the colony was prosperous in a short time. Trouble, however, was again pursuing La Salle. His friend and supporter, Count Frontenac, had been removed as governor of Canada, and De la Barre, his bitter opponent, appointed instead. Leaving Tonty in command of Fort St. Louis, La Salle decided to go to Quebec and to France, while De la Barre sent the Chevalier de Baugis to seize the colony and take possession of the fort.

La Salle was never to return to the Illinois country for which

[29] SHEA, p. 175.

he had done so much. He obtained permission from the king to equip an expedition to reach the Mississippi from the Gulf. He was determined to establish a direct all-water trade route between his Illinois colony and France that would enable him to avoid forever his Canadian persecutors and rivals. The expedition failed miserably and La Salle was assassinated in 1687.[30]

Henry de Tonty, forcibly ejected from Fort St. Louis of the Illinois, had no sooner heard of La Salle's plight in Texas than he left his fortified rock in February 13, 1686, to go to his rescue. He failed to find him at the mouth of the Mississippi and returned to the Illinois. On September 14, 1686, the remnant of La Salle's unhappy expeditionary party reached Fort St. Louis and repaired to the chapel to sing a fervent *Te Deum* in thanksgiving for their preservation.[31] There were two priests in the party, Father Cavelier, a Sulpitian and La Salle's brother, and Father Anastase Douay, a Recollect. The Jesuit, Father Allouez, was lying ill at the fort. By common agreement of the survivors, the death of La Salle had been concealed from everyone for fear that it might cause a relaxation of discipline, and Father Allouez, supposing, as did all the others, that he was on his way to Fort St. Louis, was deeply agitated and left a week later very precipitately and for the second time to avoid a meeting with him. The survivors intended to return to Quebec in all haste, and made their way across country to Chicago. They were unable to go any farther because of severe storms and returned to Fort St. Louis in October. They wintered there and set out again on March 21, 1687, reaching Chicago on March 29. They arrived in France early in October. Abbé Cavelier made a report of the expedition to the minister, Seignelay, and addressed to the king a memorial on the importance of keeping possession of the Illinois country. La Salle's far-seeing mind had not deceived him, and he knew the importance of the Illinois country if France was to retain the immense colonial domain that had become French by right of discovery. But the rulers at Versailles, lacking his

[30] PARKMAN, p. 459.

[31] Thus Joutel's account. Father Anastasius Douay, whose account of the adventurous trip is printed by SHEA, p. 224, as written originally by Father Christian Le Clerc, states that they went to "Fort Crêvecœur." But this is undoubtedly a mistake, as there is no trace of any white colony left at Fort Crêvecœur after it had been abandoned by La Salle: see note 22 above.

knowledge, relaxed their hold. And the death of La Salle closes the first and most brilliant chapter in the history of the exploration, christianization and civilization of Illinois. It is a history fall of deeds of daring by Frenchmen and Catholics, missionaries and laymen alike.

The well-nigh inexhaustible resources of the country had barely been touched. The colony at Fort St. Louis was big with promises for a bright future. When its builder and guiding genius passed away, it held its own only for a short while. The injustice done to Tonty by his forcible ejection was repaired, and a royal decree made him co-proprietor of the fort with La Forest, La Salle's lieutenant. Once more he set out from there in December, 1688, on hearing of La Salle's death, to go to the rescue of his Texas colony, but he found that the few Frenchmen left there had been massacred by the Indians. Tonty was forced to retrace his steps, and reached his post on the Illinois in September, 1689. He is one of the great figures in French-American history, although no biography has ever been written to do justice to his merits. He kept on trading at his Fort of St. Louis until in 1702 a royal order sent him to reside on the Mississippi. The establishment on the Illinois was to be discontinued. Tonty joined d'Iberville in lower Louisiana. But Fort St. Louis was too valuable a center to be entirely abandoned, and the French reoccupied it again. In 1718, a number of them were living there, chiefly traders. In 1721, however, it was once more deserted, and Father Charlevoix, passing the spot, saw only the remains of its palisades. Its history of well-nigh forty years, however, had put the white man in permanent control of Illinois. And while French influence waned in the north, it had been quietly growing farther down to the south, along the eastern bank of the Mississippi, until it became a decisive factor in bringing the whole of the Illinois territory into the American Union.

II

The scene of history now shifts to the "American Bottom," a strip of land in southwestern Illinois, extending from opposite the mouth of the Missouri for about 100 miles to the point where the Kaskaskia river formerly emptied its waters into the Mississippi.[32]

[32] A good description of the country is given by Prof. Alvord in *Ill. Hist. Collections*, Vol. ii., pp. 23*ff*.

The great fertility of the land soon attracted the white settlers, but not until the Catholic missionary had preceded and shown the way. There Father Pierre François Pinet[33] came to preach to the Indians shortly before 1700. He was born in Perigueux, France, November 11, 1660. He came to Canada as a Jesuit in 1694, and to Illinois in 1696, founding the mission of the Guardian Angel at Chicago among the Miami bands located there. But the mission was broken up the following year when Father Pinet left. One or two years later he returned to Illinois and went to the Tamaroas, an Illinois tribe on the Mississippi not far from the mouth of the Missouri in what was later known as the "American Bottom." There Father Gravier saw him in 1700 "performing in peace all the duties of a missionary."[34] The Cahokia tribe of Illinois Indians joined the Tamaroas, and the settlement became known later on as the village of Cahokia, still in existence.[35]

Shortly afterward the Kaskaskia tribe decided to remove from their old home on the Illinois, near Starved Rock. There Father Gravier had ministered to them and to other tribes that had gathered around Fort St. Louis, notably the Peorias, since March, 1684. The mission bore the title of the Immaculate Conception. About 1,700 of the tribe decided to settle near d'Iberville, Louisiana, but Father Gravier succeeded in dissuading them, and induced them to locate in the southern part of the "American Bottom." There the new mission of Kaskaskia was begun, again under the title of the Immaculate Conception.[36]

---

[33] THWAITES, *Jesuit Relations*, Vol. lxiv, p. 278

[34] *Ibid.*, Vol. lxv, p. 103.

[35] By letters patent of May, 1699, St. Vallier deprived the Jesuits of this mission, bestowing it upon priests sent out by the "Séminaire des Missions Étrangères" of Quebec. This proceeding was strongly opposed by the Jesuits and they did not consent to the change until 1701. Meanwhile Father Pinet remained with the Tamaroas until probably the spring of 1702 and then labored among the Kaskaskias. He died in Cahokia in 1704. The priests of the "Séminaire" remained in charge of the mission until the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1763–64, when they also left.

[36] A great deal of confusion has been caused among historians by this migration of the Kaskaskias. The missionaries themselves, in their letters, are sometimes rather indefinite as to the exact location of the tribe, simply inscribing them: "From the Mission of the Immaculate Conception of the Kaskaskias." *Jesuit Relations*, Vol. lxv, p. 264; Vol. lxvi, p. 245. F. A. OGG, *op. cit.*, p. 188, mistakenly ascribes the founding of the new Kaskaskia to Father Pinet. The first baptism entered in the register of the Kaskaskia mission—and it must then have been at the old location near Fort St. Louis or Starved Rock, judging from the date—is from the hand of

A French trading post was soon established. A white settlement grew up here as at Cahokia around the missions. Intermarriages with the Indians took place. Kaskaskia seems to have grown the more rapidly since it provided an excellent place of deposit and exchange, and from a mission station it speedily became not only the most important intermediate point in the traffic of the French up and down the river, but also the metropolis of the Bottom.

Between the most southern and the most northern villages other and smaller white settlements sprang up: Prairie du Rocher, Fort Chartres, St. Philippe and Grand Ruisseau. And these whites did not drive out the aborigines: "Near the French villages were the homes of the children of the prairie, together with some blacks from the south. The French always dwelt in peace with the American Indians, the management of whom they understood far better than the Anglo-Saxons."[57] Various writers, especially British officers and later French travelers, have at times passed very severe judgments upon these French settlers. However, "the first class has always been noted for its incapacity to appreciate the good characteristics of a civilization different from its own."[58] As for the depreciating remarks of some French travelers, they visited the region after the best French elements had crossed the river to the Spanish side with the beginning of the British regime in Illinois (1765). The picture framed in the mind after reading their records of Kaskaskia and Cahokia is not that of "the most debased ignorant and superstitious of humanity," but rather the reverse.

Most of these French settlers came from Canada, and with it

Father Gravier: In the year 1695, March 20th, I, Jacques Gravier, of the Society of Jesus, baptised Pierre Aco, newly-born of P. Michael Aco. Godfather was De Hautchy; Godmother, Maria Aramipinchicoue. OSMAN, *Starved Rock*, p. 141, note. The record is interesting because the father, Michael Aco, was one of the companions of La Salle, and later of Father Hennepin when he discovered the upper Mississippi. The mother, an Indian, was the daughter of the head chief of the Peorias. She was a fervent Catholic and was instrumental in converting her husband, whose lack of faith was already obvious to Father Hennepin. She also helped Fr. Gravier very much in the conversion of her tribe although her father was strongly opposed to Christianity. The difficulties Fr. Gravier had to contend with are detailed at length in his letter: *Relations*, Vol. lxiv, pp. 158–237.

[57] *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. ii, p. 16.

[58] ALVORD in *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. ii, p. 21.

they retained constant communication through trade and exchange of messages on family affairs. Only a small number had come directly from France either through Canada or Louisiana. The majority, known as the "habitants," came from the lower class and were ignorant and illiterate. They were voyageurs and coureurs de bois, hardy, self-sufficient, reckless of their lives and inured to hardship and danger. Even among them there were found men of unusual type, such as Nicolet and Duluth and the physician who treated Father Marquette during his illness at Chicago, men born to roam the wilderness and to be the advance guard of civilization in unknown regions. The care-free lives of the voyageurs rather inclined them to disorderliness. "Yet their pleasures and vices were of a far milder type than those of their counterparts, the American backwoodsmen. The French always retained a certain respect for law and constituted authority. In their petty quarrels with each other, the Frenchmen saw no disgrace in seeking from the court a reparation of honor instead of ending them with the brutal fights common among the Americans."[39]

It is due to their onesidedness that French and English travelers have so mercilessly condemned the Illinois French settlers. The picture of their village society would be incomplete if limited to the coureurs de bois and voyageurs. For it was never wholly vulgarized and depraved owing to the presence of many persons from the better class of France and Canada—the gentry, as Clarke called them. Accustomed to greater refinements of life than those afforded by the log cabin, they surrounded themselves with such elegancies as might be brought from Canada or elsewhere. Perhaps the most unbiased picture of these French–American groups is that given by the missionaries who spent their lives among them, and it presents the lights and shadows in their true perspective.[40]

These members of the gentry lived far more elegantly than the American backwoodsmen and were their superiors in culture. Their houses were commodious, and life was made easy for them by a large retinue of slaves. In social intercourse they were pleasant, their hospitality was proverbial, and their courtesy to

[39] *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. ii, p. 29.
[40] *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. x, pp. 91, 92, 93.

strangers constant. True, they long maintained the distinction between themselves and the more ignorant classes, and the democracy of the American frontier was not established among them. But this aloofness helped to preserve among them an element of refinement and elegance, however simple, which was always lacking in the more virile if less romantic communities of the American frontier.[41]

By far the largest number of these settlers were Catholics, faithful to their religion and zealous of their rights and privileges.[42] In the management of the church property the villagers were associated with the priest through the vestrymen, who were elected for this purpose from among the most prominent men of the communities. The church was the center of the religious life of the settlement, as well as of its civic and social life. The people looked forward to the church festivals and occasional public processions as important events in their monotonous village life. At the church door the assemblies of the people met; there the auction of property was held. It was after the service that the Sunday dance took place to which came the men and maidens, and which the priest also graced by his presence. The Cahokia church was in ruins in 1778, but was rebuilt in the next few years. In Kaskaskia, however, "there was a huge old pile, extremely

[41] *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. ii, p. 21. For further details about their homes, land tenure, etc., see pp. 21–22.

[42] Some French Huguenots were found amongst them in later years, although they seem to have had no religious organization of their own. Among them was Jean Girault, born in London of Huguenot parents in 1755. The Cahokia records make mention of him in 1779. He resided there holding important military commissions in civil and military life. (*Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. ii, pp. 20–21.) There was also Charles Gratiot, born in Switzerland of French Huguenot parents in 1753. He went to Canada and in 1777 he was in Cahokia where he was elected a justice of the court. He moved to St. Louis in 1781 where he became wealthy and prominent. *Ibid.*, p. 4. There were others besides, brought there by the English and American occupations; for we find Father de la Valinière accusing Father de St. Pierre of having unlawfully married Mr. Reith, a Catholic, and Miss Camp, a Protestant, at Cahokia, in 1787. *Am. Cath. Hist. Researches*, 1906, pp. 221–225. Although Catholics were predominant in the French settlements, it is apparent that no discrimination was made among the settlers on account of religion, and that all dwelt in peace together. The Cahokia records also have evidence of Irishmen being settled there before 1776. There was "Richard McCarty," an Irishman from Connecticut, married in Montreal, who wrote to his wife in French. He was captain of militia, and had a mill in Cahokia. Mention also is made in a court order of "Dominique O'flanigan." *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. ii, p. 2.

awkward and ungainly, with its projecting eaves, its walls of hewn timber, perpendicularly planted and the interstices stuffed with mortar; with its quaint old-fashioned spire, and its dark storm-beaten casements."[43] The church was 104 feet long by 44 feet wide, and had been built by the Jesuits in 1753 largely through the personal sacrifices of the missionaries themselves. As the people were devoted to their religion, the priest exercised great influence over them. However indifferent and debauched the voyageurs and coureurs de bois might sometimes become through their life in the wilderness, they were easily brought by a vigorous priest to acknowledge their dependence upon religion. At the moment of death they always sought the consolations of the Church, and left by will money for the saying of Masses. The radical thought of France may have penetrated to some extent to the Illinois settlements, but in only one instance is there evidence of it: Louis Viviat, as the Kaskaskia Court Records attest, requested in his will that "no pomp and no ceremony mark his burial and that no payment be made for Masses for the dead since the deity is not mercenary, nor is heaven to be bought."[44] The unsettled conditions that followed upon the wresting of the Illinois territory from English control also brought disorder and a condition bordering on civil and religious anarchy. Fr. de St. Pierre, writing from Kaskaskia to Fr. Paget at Detroit, on February 18, 1786, alludes to this sad state of affairs: "Truly when I find the entire region so changed and filled with the worst of men, who fear neither God nor the law, I am altogether determined to leave at the first opportunity."[45]

The settlements had then fallen on evil days, but during the French and English regimes there was a constant succession of pastors.[46] Under their fostering care the Indian missions had grown into prosperous communities when a sudden blow fell on them.[47] In pursuance of orders from France the Jesuits were to be expelled from the whole Louisiana territory, of which Illinois

[43] SHEA, quoted in *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. ii, p. 24.

[44] *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. ii, p. 24. Louis Viviat was a rich and prominent French trader. He also became a strong supporter of the British against American interests. *Ibid.*, Vol. v, p. 7, note.

[45] *Am. Cath. Hist. Researches*, 1906, p. 236.

[46] See the list for Cahokia in *The Fortnightly Review*, Vol. xx, p. 323.

[47] THWAITES, *Jesuit Relations*, Vol. lxx, pp. 212*ff*; *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. x, pp. 62*ff*.

was a part. The news reached New Orleans in 1762, but no proceedings were begun until after the treaty of peace with England the following year. The Jesuits were then cited before the Superior Council and condemned. A special courier was sent from New Orleans to Illinois to notify the Jesuits established there of their expulsion. The decree of condemnation was read to Father Watrin, the superior at Kaskaskia. The spirited narrative of this whole iniquitous proceeding, perhaps from the pen of Father Watrin himself, sets forth the bad faith and hypocrisy of its promoters. Three main reasons were assigned for their banishment: they had not taken care of their missions; they had thought only of making their estates valuable; they were usurpers of the Vicariate General of New Orleans. To argue was useless and to resist still more so.

Father Watrin was handed a copy of the decree just read to him and then made to leave his room at once while the seal was put upon it. The same was done with the other missionaries in the house.[48] There was left one hall where they could remain together although with great inconvenience, but even this favor was refused them. Driven from their house, the missionaries found quarters as best they could. The superior, sixty-seven years old, departed on foot to find a lodging a long league away with a confrère of his, Father Meurin,[49] a missionary to the savages; and the French who met him on the road showed their open displeasure at seeing the persecution begin with him. As soon as the savages learned that he had arrived among them, they came to show to him and to Father Meurin the share which they took in their distress. The other missionaries were crowded together in a house for a month. They were permitted to take their clothes and books, and the food found in their residence was allowed for their support. Finally it came to making the inventory. Time was necessary to collect and put in order the furniture of a large house, the chattels of an important estate and the cattle scattered in the fields and woods. "Besides," tersely remarks the writer of this narrative, "there was reason for not hurrying too much; the longer the delays, the better they paid

[48] A picture of it is given in *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. i, p. 463.

[49] The mission of the Indians was situated at a distance of one and a quarter leagues from the village. *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. x, p. 68.

those employed in that task." The inhabitants, not knowing whether they would have a pastor in the future, sent two petitions to the commandant to have Father Aubert retained in that capacity, but to no avail. Everything being now ready, a sale was held at the church door at the close of High Mass, and the Jesuit property went to the highest bidder, Paul Jussiaume, who seems to have acted for Jean Baptiste Bauvais, the latter becoming the actual owner of the land and buildings.[50] Vandalism ran riot in the chapel of the house: the steps of the altar were thrown down; the sacred vessels and pictures were taken away; the ornaments were given to negresses known for their evil lives; a large crucifix from the altar and the candelabra were found in a house whose reputation was not good.

When the sentence had thus been carried out with a vengeance, the missionaries were put on a boat and after twenty-seven days arrived in New Orleans, bound for France. But one of them was determined to make a supreme effort. Touched to the quick by the piteous pleas of the Indians, and knowing besides "in what danger the Illinois neophytes were of soon forgetting religion if they remained long without missionaries," Father Meurin, although sickly for years, insisted with so much determination that he be allowed to return to his former field of labor, that permission was granted him together with a promise that a pension of 600 livres would be asked for him at court. When his confrères embarked for France he returned to Illinois, but did not take up his residence at his former mission, preferring to reside on the western bank of the river, then under the Spanish flag, in the village of St. Genevieve. He, however, visited the various

[50] The Cahokia priests, being Sulpitians sent out by the Séminaire des Missions Étrangères of Quebec, were not included in the decree of expulsion. But the superior in charge, Father Forget, on hearing of the decree against the Jesuits, sold all he could and retired. (*Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. xi, p. 323; Gage to Conway, June 24, 1766.) On May 3, 1767, Father Boiret wrote from Quebec to Father Meurin complaining that Father Forget sold in 1763 all their property, movable and immovable, belonging to the Holy Family mission at Cahokia, while the inhabitants made opposition to the execution of this irregular sale. He shows that Father Forget, claiming to act in the name of the Séminaire des Missions Étrangères at Paris, had no authority to do so since the Séminaire of Quebec to which the mission and goods in question belonged, was independent of the Paris institution. He asks Father Meurin to help him to get this mission on its feet again, promising to send priests as soon as possible. (*Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. xi, p. 565.)

Illinois settlements regularly, being now the only priest left to attend the widely scattered settlements.

On March 23, 1767, he wrote from the "Rectory of the Immaculate Conception at Kaskaskia, English colony, diocese of Quebec, at the Illinois"[51] to Bishop Briand, the new incumbent of that see. He details at length the deplorable condition in which he finds himself and begs the bishop to send priests to administer the parishes of the Immaculate Conception at Kaskaskia, of St. Joseph at Prairie du Rocher, of the Holy Family at Cahokia. Besides these Illinois missions he attends the parish of St. Genevieve, his residence, and the newly founded village of St. Louis, some thirty miles to the north. The absence of priests had quickly worked havoc among the wilderness settlements and he complains of disorder, of churches in disrepair, and of the opposition of a few parishioners "who say openly that I have no title to the parish, which they would not have dared to in the time of the Messrs. Sterling and Farmer, English commanders who gave me their fullest protection."

Shortly after Father Meurin's return the political status of the inhabitants had been changed, and their communities suffered considerably because of it. In October, 1765, the Illinois country passed from French to British control. The proclamation to this effect issued by General Th. Gage, commander-in-chief of the army, contained an important clause, granting the French the right of the free exercise of the Roman Catholic religion in the same manner as in Canada. It provided, moreover, that all the inhabitants of Illinois who had been subjects of the king of France might, if they desired, sell their estates and retire with their effects to Louisiana. No restraint would be placed on their emigration except for debt or on account of criminal processes. Both concessions, aimed at winning and retaining the French, failed to do so. The wealth of the country soon became considerably impaired under the British occupation because of the exodus of a large number of French families. The best and most influential among them, taking their cattle, grain and effects across the ferries at Cahokia and Kaskaskia, found homes in St. Louis and St. Genevieve on the Spanish side.[52] Probably a large

[51] *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. xi, p. 521*ff*.
[52] *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. x., p. 23.

part of these left in the hope that in Louisiana they might enjoy their ancient laws and privileges to a larger extent. Gordon, an English traveler who passed through the country shortly afterward, bears eloquent witness to the desolation in his "Journal"[53] under date of August 19, 1766. The English authorities themselves were deeply concerned over the depopulation. Sterling, writing to Gage under date of December 25, 1765, says: "The inhabitants (of Kaskaskia and Cahokia) complain very much for want of priests. There is but one now remains, the rest either having died or gone away, and he stays on the other side (of the river—Father Meurin) . . . The priest might be of great use to us if he was brought over to this side, which I make no doubt might be effectuated, provided his former appointments were allowed to him, which were 600 livres per annum from the king as priest to the Indians."[54] And Gage, writing to Conway under date of June 24, 1766, transmits to him a lengthy document relative to the "Effects of the Jesuits" (Quelques Traits sur la Mission des Jésuites aux Illinois).[55] He frankly disapproves of the procedure of the French in expelling the Jesuits and selling their property, the more so since this sale took place after the conclusion of the treaty with Great Britain which ceded the Illinois territory to the British crown. He intends to have the property restored as far as possible, and concludes: "The inhabitants are demanding and soliciting for a priest, and if they get none go over to the Spanish side of the river, a circumstance that would at present be very prejudicial to our interest."[56] But priests were very difficult to get, and for some time Father Meurin remained the only one to minister to the Catholics of the Illinois territory. Bishop Briand made him Vicar General, and writing to him on August 7, 1767, he promises to send him one or two priests in the spring of the following year.[57] On May 9, 1767, Father Meurin had asked that at least four priests be sent to attend the various missions, but the Bishop was obviously unable to grant his request for that many helpers.

---

[53] *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. xi, p. 299.
[54] *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. xi, p. 124.
[55] *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. xi, p. 326.
[56] *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. xi, p. 323.
[57] *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. xi, p. 587.

In 1768, however, Father Pierre Gibault arrived from Canada, and his name figures prominently and honorably in the subsequent history of Illinois. The British regime was of short duration and marked by no events of importance. No attempt was made to develop the resources of the country, and the settlements already in existence kept on steadily declining. Then came the revolution on the Atlantic seaboard, and the various colonies, now formed into an independent nation, endeavored to push their boundaries westward to the Mississippi. The widely scattered white settlements west of the Alleghenies suffered much from the depredations of Indian war parties, who were encouraged by the English authorities to harass them. Lieutenant Governor Hamilton even paid the Indians in goods for the scalps of whites they brought in.[58] The incursions of the savages, assisted by the Tories, upon the frontiers of New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Kentucky were almost continuous during the spring and summer of 1778. George Rogers Clark had successfully led the Virginia militia in several retaliatory expeditions against the Indians. But he became gradually aware that, as long as the British held control in the French villages of the Illinois, these would be rallying points for the Indian war parties sent out against the Kentucky posts. He saw that the surest defense against these forays would be to capture these posts and win the friendship of the French.[59] Governor Patrick Henry favored the plan which was to be carried out secretly whilst ostensibly designed as a defense for Kentucky. Overcoming all obstacles by his dauntless courage, Clark traveled down the Ohio and then across country with his little army. The English were altogether unaware of his coming and he entered Kaskaskia and took it by surprise on the night of July 4, 1778. It was well known to him that the inhabitants were not very strongly attached to the British. The next morning, therefore, after assuring Father Gibault, the pastor[60] "who was rather prejudiced in favor of us," Clark writes, that his people would not be molested in any way because of their religion, they all gladly took the "Oath of alle-

[58] *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. v, p. 37, note 3.

[59] *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. v, p. 42.

[60] *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. v, p. 121. Father Gibault was now the only priest in Illinois, Father Meurin having died in 1777 at Prairie du Rocher. Cf. *The Beginnings of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction in St. Louis* (1764–1776), by Rev. J. J. Conway, S.J., in the Missouri Historical Society's *Publications*, No. 14, St. Louis, 1897.

giance to America." The other French settlements in the American Bottom were soon won over. There remained only Post St. Vincent in Indiana, from which Clark wished by all means to expel the English, "for without the possession of that post all our views would have been blasted."[61] Clark sent for Father Gibault, knowing that "he was inclined to the American interest previous to our arrival in the country. . . . In answer to all my queries he informed me that it was not worth my while to cause any military preparation to be made at the Falls (of the Ohio) for the attack of St. Vincent, although the place was strong and a great number of Indians in the neighborhood . . . that he expected that when the inhabitants were fully acquainted with what had passed at the Illinois and the present happiness of their friends and made fully acquainted with the nature of the war, that their sentiments would greatly change . . . that if it was agreeable to me, he would take this business on himself and had no doubt of his being able to bring that place over to the American interest without my being at the trouble of marching troops against it; that his business being altogether spiritual he wished that another person might be charged with the temporal part of the embassy, but he would privately direct the whole, and he named Doctor Lafont as his associate."[62] They set out on their patriotic journey, and Clark further reports: "Mr. Gibault and party arrived safe and after their spending a day or two in explaining matters to the people, they universally acceded to the proposal . . . and went in a body to the church where the oath of allegiance was administered to them in the most solemn manner . . . and the American flag displayed."

Vincennes was retaken by the English and the following year Clark set out with an armed expedition to reconquer it:" We were conducted out of the town by the inhabitants and Mr. Gibault the priest, who after a very suitable discourse to the purpose, gave us all absolution. And we set out on a forlorn hope indeed."[63] But this "forlorn hope" issued in a brilliant victory over the English forces, and gained for America the per-

---

[61] *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. v, p. 239.
[62] *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. v, p. 237–238.
[63] *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. v., p. 139.

manent control of the Northwest.[64] But from that moment on Father Gibault was looked upon as a "Rebel" by the English authorities, as well as by his ecclesiastical superiors in Canada. Accusations of every nature, none of which were ever in any way substantiated, were brought against him. In his report to Lord George Sackville, secretary of state for the colonies, Lieutenant Governor Hamilton, who was captured by Clark at the surrender of Vincennes, penned this philippic: "One of the deserters at Vincennes was brother to Gibault the priest, who had been an active agent for the rebels and whose vicious and immoral conduct was sufficient to do infinite mischief in a country where ignorance and bigotry give full scope to the depravity of a licentious ecclesiastic. This wretch it was who absolved the French inhabitants from their allegiance to the King of Great Britain. To enumerate the vices of the inhabitants would be to give a long catalogue, but to assert that they are not in possession of a single virtue is no more than truth, and justice require; still the most eminently vicious and scandalous was the reverend Monsieur Gibault."[65]

Some years later, May 28, 1788, Father Gibault wrote to his superior, the Bishop of Quebec,[66] asking to be recalled "because of my age of fifty-one years, the need I have of being better sheltered after so many hardships which inevitably accompany so many journeys and long trips." He found that he had been accused of various misdemeanors, the gravest of which obviously was that "he had been active for the American Republic." The Bishop of Quebec was adamant and in a letter to Bishop Carroll,

---

[64] Clark refers twice, at great length, to the important rôle played by Father Gibault; in his "Letter to George Mason, November 19, 1779" (*Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. v., pp. 121*ff*) and in his 'Memoir," *ibid.*, p. 237*ff*. Virginia realized the great debt she owed him and in a "Letter of Instructions to Clark from the Virginia Council, December 12, 1778" (*ibid.*, pp. 78*ff*). we read: "Upon a fair presumption that the people about Detroit have similar inclinations with those of Illinois and Wabash, I think it possible that they may be brought to expel their British masters and become fellow-citizens of a free state. I recommend this to your serious consideration and to consult with some confidential person on the subject. Perhaps Mr. Gibault the priest (to whom this country owes many thanks for his zeal and services) may promote this affair." And Patrick Henry, writing to Clark on December 15, 1778 (*ibid.*, p. 87), says: "I beg you will present my compliments to Mr. Gibault and Doctor Lafont and thank them for me for their good services for the state."

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 184.

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 585.

dated October 3, 1788,[67] he wrote: "Complaints of different kinds, especially of treason towards the government, caused my predecessors to entertain some antipathy towards him, so much so that I propose to give him no employment for the future. That would be easier for you to do." Matters were amicably adjusted between him and his new Bishop and he continued to serve the French Catholics now in Vincennes, then in St. Genevieve, visiting the Illinois country as opportunity offered. For the high hopes raised among the French by the American occupation had not materialized. Notwithstanding repeated appeals from the inhabitants, Congress was dilatory in giving the country a stable civil government. Factions arose as the turbulent years went on without bringing relief, and the population of the American Bottom kept on steadily declining. The period of greatest emigration occurred between 1787 and 1790 when anarchy reached its climax and the Spaniards on the other side of the river were holding out the greatest inducements. A census list of Kaskaskia for the year 1790 shows only forty-four heads of families, a decrease of 779 in the French population of the village since 1783. The picture of Kaskaskia in 1790 as described by its people in a petition to Major Hamtranck[68] is one of utter misery and despair: "Our horses, horned cattle and corn are stolen and destroyed without the power of making any effective resistance. Our houses are in ruins and decay; our lands are uncultivated; debtors abscond and absconding; our little common destroyed. We are apprehensive of a dearth of corn and our best prospects are misery and distress, or, what is more probably, an untimely death by the hand of savages. We are well convinced that all these misfortunes have befallen us for want of some superior or commanding authority, for ever since the cession of this territory to Congress we have been neglected as an abandoned people to encounter all the difficulties that are always attendant upon anarchy and confusion. Neither did we know from authority until latterly to what power we were subject. The greater part of our citizens have left the country on this account to reside in

[67] *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. v, p. 586–590.

[68] He was Commandant at Post Vincennes and a Canadian Catholic who had served in the Revolution as captain in the Fifth New York Regiment. *Am. Cath. Hist. Res.*, 1906, p. 236.

the Spanish dominions; others are now following and we are fearful, nay certain, that without your assistance the small remainder will be obliged to follow their example."[69] The picture was only too true. But fortunately the more energetic families who moved across the Mississippi into territory that was for a few more years to remain under Spanish dominion, were not lost forever to the American commonwealth.

On the soil of Illinois, however, they have left their impress for all time to come, and history can never forget what these French Catholic explorers and pioneers have wrought there. From the days of Marquette and Allouez and La Salle and Tonty and Hennepin down to Father Gibault they carried on their work of discovery and civilization against the greatest odds. Illinois and America owe to them a debt of patriotic gratitude. And in this centenary year of Illinois statehood, when it is proposed to erect a centennial memorial building, nothing could be more fitting than that in it a statue should be erected or some other suitable commemoration should be made of that staunch French-American most deserving of recognition—Father Pierre Gibault.

J. B. Culemans, Ph.D.,
Moline, Ill.

[69] *Ill. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. ii, p. cli.

DIOCESAN ORGANIZATION IN SPANISH COLONIES

In the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW for July, 1916 (Vol. ii, No. 2), I traced the growth of diocesan organization in the Spanish Colonies up to the establishment of the parish of St. Augustine in 1565. In the present article I propose to give a summary of the relations that were maintained between that parish and its bishops to the year 1819, when Florida's becoming a part of the American Union severed the connection with the Spanish-American hierarchy. The following division will be observed: I. Episcopal Visitations from the Diocese of Santiago, 1565-1783. II. From the Diocese of Havana, 1787-1794, and from the Diocese of Louisiana and the Floridas, 1794–1819. III. Synodal and Episcopal Legislation specially affecting Florida.

It is well to remember that this parish was established as such from the very beginning without having ever been a mission station, and that its purpose was to serve the white inhabitants, the Indians being looked after by the Fathers in other parts of the Peninsula.

I. EPISCOPAL VISITATIONS OF THE FIRST PERIOD (1565-1783)

In the article referred to above I wrote: "Florida is said to have been made (ecclesiastically) independent of Cuba and a bishop (Juan Suarez) appointed, in 1527." I gave the statement for what it was worth, but I have since come to suspect that it is worth nothing. It rests altogether on a single piece of evidence, and that from a source not altogether trustworthy, viz., the *Ensayo Cronologico para la Historia de la Florida* of Barcía, published under the anagram of "Don Gabriel de Cardenas y Cano" at Madrid in 1723. Here Father Suarez is called a bishop but no other writer so entitles him nor is his name to be found in any list of Spanish-American bishops. We shall have occasion to refer again to the inaccuracy of this work, in connection with the Visitation of 1720. For that matter, we stumble over another unsupported statement of the *Ensayo* at the very outset, for we read there that an Episcopal Visitation was made of the parish of St. Augustine in 1595, whereas every other writer mentions as the first that of 1606.

1. BY BISHOP CABEZAS DE ALTAMIRANO (1606)

We must not conclude that Florida was neglected simply because so long a time went by before a bishop came over to inspect it. There was in Cuba itself a good deal of work for even the most zealous prelate, and the danger of travel then in that part of the world was great enough to go far in excusing the long absences of the bishops. The City of Havana was destroyed twice in the sixteenth century, the hostile fleets of France and England were an almost constant menace to Spanish shipping and the West Indian Islands were nests for pirates of all nations. The very man we are speaking of had, shortly before arriving in Florida, been captured by pirates while he was travelling through Cuba and held for ransom. More than ordinary courage was required in such circumstances to embark, as he did hardly more than a year later, for Florida. His visitation seems to have been thorough, and serves to throw light on the labors of the clergy; for large numbers came forward to receive Confirmation, among them being some candidates for Orders. This is the first time, as far as we know, that Confirmation was administered within the present territory of the United States (Continental).

2. BY FATHER LUIS JERONIMO DE ORE (1616)

This friar, a Franciscan and a native of Peru, was engaged in missionary work in Cuba when the Bishop, Almendarez de Toledo, requested him to go to Florida as the representative of the Ordinary to inspect and report on the state of religion there. The Bishop found it impossible to go in person because of the somewhat strained relations then existing between himself and the civil authorities. Whether the choice of a Franciscan was by accident or design is not known, but it was at any rate fortunate, for the Franciscans in Florida claimed that by virtue of a royal *cedula* of 1595 they were exempt from the jurisdiction of anyone except the Bishop of Santiago himself or an official of their own Order. The unpleasant incidents to which this claim gave rise later were in the present instance obviated by the fact that the representative of the Bishop was a Franciscan. Their case seems to have rested also on certain concessions of Pope Adrian VI in 1522. By him they were empowered to elect in their American missions their own Superior every three years, who

would enjoy the full authority of the Minister-General, with episcopal jurisdiction over the houses of his Order and the right to exercise all episcopal functions except Ordination. The individual friars were empowered to exercise papal authority when they judged it necessary for the conversion of the Indians. These privileges held where there was no bishop or where the bishop could not be reached without a journey of two days. And a confirmation and extension by Pope Paul III in 1535 rendered the Friars in the missions of Spanish America almost independent of episcopal jurisdiction.

The Visitor arrived at St. Augustine on November 13, 1616, and found the parish in excellent condition as to temporalities. The material necessities seem always to have been well supplied, due doubtless to the fact that the church in St. Augustine was the sole recipient of the tithes collected in that part of the diocese, the Missions obtaining their support from other sources. But the provision for spiritual needs was imperfect, due to the want of a Bishop, and the consequent rarity of Confirmation and Ordination. In 1655, a strong petition was made by the governor to the king (Philip IV) to make Florida a diocese, or at least a Vicariate. There was some discussion, and the prelates immediately interested, the Bishop of Santiago and the Archbishop of Santo Domingo, were consulted, as well as the Council of the Indies, but there the matter rested for a long time. Not until 1709 was an Auxiliary consecrated, and in the whole course of her history under Spain, Florida succeeded in securing but three.

3. BY FATHER JUAN PIZARRO (1673)

At first the Bishop (Calderon), being unable to make a Visitation in person, adopted the simple and obvious expedient of deputing the resident parish priest, Francisco de Sotolongo. But the Franciscans objected, as they were jealous of their rights, so the appointment had to be cancelled and in place of Father de Sotolongo the Bishop sent a Franciscan, Father Juan Moreno Pizarro. The report he submitted showed the necessity of a resident bishop, chiefly to encourage Ordinations. Florida, like the rest of Spanish America, began to produce vocations early in her history, and the number would probably have been greater but for her separation from the rest of the Spanish

territory and the necessity of going over to Cuba to be ordained. Such a journey was a serious consideration in those days, when the buccaneers played a rôle similar to that of the submarine today. Consequently the next Visitation occurred the very next year.

4. BY BISHOP CALDERON (1674)

This was the most thorough inspection the Church in Florida experienced in all the Spanish portion of her career, and it is not astonishing when we consider the character of the man who made it. He was the most energetic prelate who ever ruled the Diocese of Santiago, and he found abundant opportunity for the exercise of his zeal in this outlying part of his diocese. Coming under the escort of Spanish war-vessels, he landed in St. Augustine on the twenty-third of August, 1674, and spent the following eight months journeying through the length and breadth of this extensive territory. Nothing escaped him; he penetrated even into what is now South Carolina, seeing with his own eyes every church and religious establishment of any kind, administering Confirmation to more than thirteen thousand persons, conferring Minor Orders (for the first time in the United States), distributing in alms over eleven thousand dollars at a time when his revenue from Florida was about four hundred, establishing new mission centers and issuing some important legislation. So energetic and determined was he that an attempt was actually made to poison him. New life was infused into the Church, but to sustain it without a resident bishop was impossible, and some years were still to pass before that happy consummation was to be realized.

5. BY FATHER JUAN FERRO MACHADO (1688)

When Bishop Diego Evelino de Compostela was appointed to the See of Santiago in 1687, he was expressly commanded by the King to go to Florida as soon as he could be spared from Cuba. Finding on his arrival that it would probably be a long time before he could do this, he sent as his representative a Cuban priest, Father Machado, who bore personally the expenses of the journey. But again the Franciscans objected: Father Machado was neither a bishop nor a Franciscan, therefore they would not permit him to inspect their houses. All he could do was to make a formal Visitation of the parish church of St. Augustine, on February 20,

1688; he was not suffered to make any official inspection of the Missions; and one of the Franciscans even went so far as to publish a book in which he denied that Florida was under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Santiago at all—a position utterly impossible to maintain but not to be wondered at in the present instance, since the author was that Father Ayeta who was so ready to take up arms against bishops. On at least three other occasions we find him attacking what he considered episcopal pretensions, viz., at Puebla, Guadalajara and Quito. Happily the bishop was less narrow and did not suffer this incident to disturb his relations with the Friars. He continued on friendly terms with them and to send some of their number into Florida from time to time.

6. BY FATHER PONCE DE LEON (1704)

Though Bishop Compostela reigned long over the Diocese of Santiago he never succeeded in carrying out the command of the King to visit the Peninsula of Florida, and died without setting foot in that part of his diocese. And as the Visitation by Father Machado amounted to so little in consequence of the Franciscan opposition, it scarcely deserves to be included in the list. The same might be said of the next, were it not for the important results it had a few years after. Father de Leon came in 1704 and what he saw convinced him (as it had convinced everyone else) that Florida needed a bishop of her own. Of course the region was not in the position to be created a separate diocese but it called for a good deal more attention than the Bishop of Santiago could give it. Of the six Visitations held up to this time, a period of nearly a century and a half, only two had been by the Ordinary himself; and this was now presented so strongly that the Bishop of Santiago was instructed to choose an Auxiliary to reside permanently in Florida. The choice fell on a priest of Havana, Dionisio Rezinó, who was consecrated at Merida in Yucatán in 1709, as Bishop of Adramyttium. It is interesting to note that of the three Auxiliaries of Florida two held this titular see, and that it was afterwards the titular see of Cardinal Gibbons from 1868 to 1872.

7. BY BISHOP REZINÒ (1710)

The new bishop lost no time in coming to his field of work, but the bright hopes of those solicitous for the welfare of the Florida

church were not to be realized. For, after travelling over a small part of the territory and administering Confirmation a few times he returned to Havana (probably on account of ill health) and died there the next year. Here again we have an instance of Barcía's inaccuracy. He tells of a visit to Florida by Bishop Rezinò in 1721, though the Bishop had been buried in Havana ten years before. Perhaps he is really referring to the Visitation made in 1720.

8. BY FATHER ROMERO Y MONTAÑEZ (1720)

He came at the command of Bishop Valdez and had a rather unsatisfactory report to make. The Parish Priest, Father Pedro Lorenzo de Acevedo (not to be confused with the earlier missioner de Acevedo in New Mexico) was growing old and had been neglecting some of his duties, particularly the keeping of the parochial registers. It was found necessary to replace him, though he remained in St. Augustine until his death fifteen years later.

9. BY BISHOP TEJADA (1735-45)

Another long period elapsed before the next Auxiliary appeared, in the person of one of the most remarkable of the Spanish-American bishops of that time, Francisco de San Buenaventura Martinez de Tejada Diez de Velasco. Appointed Auxiliary to the Bishop of Santiago for the Peninsula of Florida he was consecrated in 1735 Bishop of Tricca (Trikala) *i. p. i.*, and came immediately to Florida remaining there ten years, when he was transferred to the See of Yucatán. (Later, in 1752, he was transferred to Guadalajara, and died there in 1760. As Bishop of Guadalajara he ruled over what is now Texas, so that he will appear again in the treatment of diocesan organization in the Southwest.) This first period of his episcopal activity, though perhaps not so well known as those that followed, is no whit less remarkable, the work he did in Florida showing what could be accomplished by an active bishop free to devote his whole energy to that struggling flock. For zeal had begun to flag and it is possible that some of the missions would have died out had he not been there to keep them alive. Certainly there would have been little, if any, education in Florida but for him, since the only school there was the one he maintained. We may even say

without exaggeration that the preservation of Spanish civil rule was partly owing to him; for when the English attacked St. Augustine in 1739, their defeat was due in great measure to the courage he inspired in the defenders. His departure six years after this was regretted by everybody in Florida as a misfortune. It was during his administration that a special mission was established for the negro slaves escaping into Florida from the English Colonies, and many of them became Catholics.

10. BY BISHOP PONCE Y CARASCO (1751-55)

On the departure of Bishop Tejada a sad lustrum supervened for Florida. The constant menace of the English in the north had a disastrous effect on the Indian Missions; it would appear that there was little Christianity left in the region between St. Augustine and the new English colony of Georgia. The new Auxiliary, consecrated in 1751 Bishop of Adramyttium *i. p. i.* (the titular see of Bishop Rezinò), came that same year to Florida but could do almost nothing outside the City of St. Augustine. When he left in 1755, Florida was in a poor way indeed. Still worse days were in store for the Church there, for Spain's hold was weakening and was soon to relax entirely. Bishop Ponce would be the last Prelate in Florida under the Santiago régime but for an accident of war that brought about a visit from the Ordinary himself.

11. BY BISHOP MORELL DE SANTA CRUZ (1763)

The Bishop of Santiago was in Havana when the English captured that city in 1762 and was carried off by them to Charleston. After a short detention he was sent to St. Augustine and improved the opportunity to inspect what was left of the parish and the missions. Over six hundred persons were confirmed and his preaching rendered his stay a sort of "mission" in the modern parochial sense; but his good work was cut short when it had hardly begun, by the Treaty of Paris in 1763. In return for Havana, Spain ceded Florida to England and the Bishop returned to Cuba, dying there in 1768.

The treaty by which England became possessed of Florida explicitly safeguarded the religious rights of the inhabitants.

Full freedom to practise the Catholic worship was accorded, the Bishop of Santiago was recognized as their ecclesiastical ruler, and church property was not to be taken without just compensation. But this last clause was violated almost from the beginning, so that the Spanish Catholics, who at first intended to stay on, were practically forced out, the English refusing them a church to worship in. In consequence of this gross injustice, diocesan authority almost ceased, though the King continued to appoint priests for Florida during this period. Strange to say, however, the English were themselves the instrument of a revival of Catholicity during their rule, in an interesting and curious episode. In 1767, an English physician named Turnbull from South Carolina (father of Robert Turnbull of Charleston, prominent in the 'thirties of last century as a leader of the Nullification Party) came to the district now called New Smyrna with a colony of about fifteen hundred Greeks, Italians and Minorcans, and settled them there to cultivate indigo. The Governor of the Province became a partner in the enterprise and between them these two men reduced the poor laborers to slavery, though fine promises had been made in the beginning. In 1776 they were released and allowed to come to St. Augustine. Most of them were Catholics and the Bishop allowed the priests who came with them to erect a church at Mosquito Inlet, a place about seventy miles south of St. Augustine. Here they worshipped until their removal to St. Augustine where the Governor (not the one who had been a partner in the original scheme) gave them a quarter of the city for themselves. But as all the churches had been taken they were compelled to worship in their own homes. When Florida was restored to Spain in 1783 they formed a large portion of the population. From the fact that the "Greeks" were Roman Catholics it may be conjectured that they came from the region about Patras, largely inhabited at the present time by descendants of the Italians of the days of Genoese occupation. The Roman Catholic church in Patras is still known as "the Italian Church" and Italian is the language of the parishioners. On the other hand, "New Smyrna" would suggest Asia Minor as their place of origin.

II. EPISCOPAL VISITATIONS OF THE SECOND PERIOD (1783-1819)

In 1783 Florida was restored to Spain and remained under her rule until 1819, when it was purchased by the United States. The record of this period is naturally very brief. Shortly after Spain resumed possession the Diocese of Santiago was divided (1787) and the Peninsula became part of the new Diocese of Havana. The following year it was visited by Bishop Cirillo Sieni (perhaps better known as Cirillo de Barcelona), who had been already active in Louisiana since 1772 as Vicar General for that region and Florida, with the title of Bishop of Tricca (Trikala). At a later date (1791) we find him at Pensacola. But his career in Florida seems to have been no more peaceful than it was anywhere else, and ultimately he was ordered by the King to return to his native province of Catalonia in Spain. It is uncertain whether he ever arrived there, and the time and place of his death are not known. But his administration is interesting as affording an idea of the changes that had come over the province during its subjection to British rule. The English language had become so common that when the Spanish Government undertook the restoration of the Catholic Religion on the recovery of Florida in 1783, the King was obliged to secure the services of men able to speak both English and Spanish. This accounts for such names as Hassett, McCaffrey, Crosby, O'Reilly and Wallis on the parish registers. These were Irishmen who had studied in Spain at the Irish College in Salamanca, and their readiness to accept a charge in distant Florida, thereby relinquishing all hope of ever seeing their own land again, is evidence of pure and disinterested zeal. The Irish were numerous among the laity as well, the regiment at St. Augustine being officered and to a large extent manned by them; and altogether the complexion of the church was considerably different from what it had been in the old days. In fact, the Spaniards must have been considerably outnumbered if we reckon the New Smyrna settlers, whose descendants are still to be found in Florida. Of course the priests we have mentioned came out as appointees of the Government, the King paying their passage and providing their salary ($350 a year). Their labors would make edifying reading but are somewhat outside our scope; apparently Bishop Sieni was pleased with them since the only

objection he made to their manner of administration was to their custom of making the entries of baptisms and marriages in Latin and ordered that the entries be made in Spanish, which was done.

In 1793 occurred another change in the ecclesiastical status of Florida. So many complaints had been made of the sad condition of religion there and in Louisiana that the King (Charles IV) determined to separate these regions and to erect them into a new diocese. This was accomplished in 1793 or 1794 (the Bull is not to be had, so the exact date cannot be given) and the See, known as "Louisiana and the Floridas," was bestowed upon Father Luis Peñalver de Cardenas, a priest of Havana who had long enjoyed the confidence of the Bishops in Cuba and had actually been proposed for the diocese of Havana when that See was erected in 1789. He proved to be a man of extraordinary zeal and clearness of vision, as may be gathered from the lengthy though somewhat pessimistic reports he issued. But on only one occasion did he succeed in making a Visitation of Florida, and beyond the bare fact little is known. After his transfer to Guatemala in 1801, the diocese was administered by Father Hassett, one of the Irish priests, until the new bishop should arrive. The man selected was a Franciscan, Father Porro y Peinado, but even before this Spain had promised (October 1, 1800) to transfer Louisiana to the French and since it was only a question of time when the actual cession would be made the Spanish Government went no further with the appointment of a Bishop for Louisiana and Father Porro was ultimately sent to the See of Tarragona in Spain. The French ownership of the Mississippi Valley (which was never real, as they at once sold it to the United States) left Florida again under Havana but there is no episcopal visitation to record for these closing years of Spanish rule. Perhaps the rather tiresome wranglings between Spain and the United States over the eastern boundary of Louisiana and the question of "East" and "West" Florida had something to do with this. As time went on it became increasingly evident that this portion of Spain's dominions was to share the fate of Louisiana; indeed, at one stage of the negotiations American troops actually occupied a part of the Peninsula, and the transfer was ultimately effected in 1819 (February 22).

By the political change its ecclesiastical status was again affected. Bishop Du Bourg of New Orleans assumed control and in order to ensure the regularity of administration he issued faculties to the priests then in Florida. But the Bishop of Havana caused a little trouble. At first he refused to recognize any alteration that had not been notified to him through the King of Spain and the Patriarch of the Indies; then he recalled his priests and requested Bishop England of Charleston to take charge of Florida, still not acknowledging any jurisdiction of Bishop Du Bourg. If this mode of acting is anything more than pettiness, it serves to attest how deeply rooted in the Spanish mind was the idea of state control of the Church. But any doubts as to jurisdiction were set at rest when, on November 5, 1826, the Right Reverend Michael Portier landed at Mobile as Bishop of Oleno and Vicar Apostolic of Alabama and the Floridas. On that day the Spanish era of the ecclesiastical history of Florida was closed.

III. SYNODAL AND EPISCOPAL LEGISLATION SPECIALLY AFFECTING FLORIDA

Of the Provincial and Diocesan Synods held during the period from 1518 to 1819, Florida figures prominently in but one, that, namely, held in Santiago under Bishop Juan García de Palacios in June, 1684. Before this the Provincial Council of Santo Domingo in 1621, under Archbishop Almendarez, obtained in Florida, but the only special reference to the Peninsula is to the effect that after collecting statistics regarding Easter Communions, the priests of Florida were to convey them in person to the Ordinary, taking the first ship for Cuba. The general regulations adopted in 1684 follow closely those of Santo Domingo; but the latter is notable as having devoted a special section to the affairs of the Church in Florida. As the text is far too long to reproduce in its entirety here, we shall present a summary, along with some explanatory comment. The statutes are not intended directly for the Parish of St. Augustine which, as a canonically erected parish, was subject to the regular diocesan legislation; they relate rather to the Indian Missions. But the side lights cast on the general religious life make them pertinent to the present study.

The second section is at first amusing, for it forbids the

Indians to play ball, but the mystery is dissolved when we recall that the prohibited game was in reality a sort of superstitious rite kept over from pagan days. There is a prohibition of keeping married Indians in St. Augustine away from their wives, an abuse which at times led to serious disorder. This is but one out of many instances that will readily occur to the student of Spanish-American history, of how the Church was hampered in her work of evangelizing the native races by the selfishness of the Spanish settlers. Having brought the poor Indians into the city, the whites kept them there at work away from their families at the Mission Stations, to their moral and physical hurt. Sometimes they were forced to labor even on Sundays and Holy Days and thus prevented from hearing Mass. These abuses the parish priest is ordered to correct in his capacity of religious superior of the Spaniards, since he had no direct jurisdiction over the Indians. A distinction was made between Indians and Spaniards in the matter of Holy Days of Obligation, the number for the former being put at thirteen, whereas the latter were still required to observe thirty-eight, as put down in the Provincial Council of Santo Domingo in 1622. Readers at all familiar with Spanish and Spanish-American customs will not regard these numbers as unduly large. In Mexico, for example, by the middle of the seventeenth century, the Holy Days had come to average two a week, though not all were "Days of Obligation"; and in 1644 the Audiencia sent a special petition to King Philip IV to reduce the number. But we must not be led astray in this matter by mere numbers. The church authorities were reasonable in their demands. Not only did they relieve the Indians of the duty of hearing Mass on most of the days when the Spaniards were supposed to go, but the Spanish settlers themselves enjoyed considerable mitigation in this regard. Those who lived from three to nine miles from a church or chapel were required to hear Mass only once in a fortnight, those at a greater distance might come less often, while those whose homes were sixty leagues away were not asked to come more frequently than once a year. Beside the smaller number of Holy Days, the Indians were also exempted from fasting except on the Fridays in Lent, Holy Saturday and the Vigil of Christmas. The necessity for the Religious to receive faculties from the Ordinary of Santiago was re-affirmed

at this time, and these Religious were strictly forbidden to minister to any but the Indians of their Missions.

This is the only instance we know of strictly synodal legislation, but at least two of the bishops promulgated special regulations that are not without interest. When Bishop Calderon made his memorable Visitation in 1674-75, he was so displeased with the way the Indians, by being forced to work on Sundays and Holy Days, were suffered to remain in almost complete ignorance of Christian Doctrine, that he solemnly published an edict that the Franciscans who could speak the native tongues were to teach Catechism in them every Sunday and Holy Day, and to these classes masters were to send their Indian servants. The penalty for violation was excommunication and (in case the offender was a master) a fine. Moreover, he commanded that at the High Mass in the parish church every Sunday the people were to be reminded of his having forbidden the forced labor of Indians on Sundays and Holy Days.

When Bishop Peñalver came to Louisiana in 1795 one of his first thoughts was to hold a diocesan synod, but the paucity of priests and the enormous distances many of them would have to travel made it too difficult, so he was perforce contented with issuing a series of instructions which were to hold until the synod could be convened. In the circumstances he was chary of making any considerable alterations in the laws already enacted and in consequence the letter he issued on this occasion amounts to little more than an exhortation to pastoral zeal. Florida is especially mentioned twice: First (paragraph 34), in connection with the duty of the Vicar of St. Augustine regarding the marriage of strangers, and second (paragraph 54), regarding the conversion of the Indians, which work is in this instance entrusted to the parish priest. The command, issued by Bishop Sieni seven or eight years before, that the registers be kept in Spanish, is repeated (paragraph 38); and there is a reference to the Right of Sanctuary which calls for a few words. The passage reads: "When any criminal takes refuge in a church they are to permit him to be taken under a sworn guarantee (*caucion juratoria*), reporting all to us, that if the crime is one of those excepted or that requires decision, when the question of immunity comes up, we

can decide what is legal with law and reference to Canon Law, and the Royal Order given at Pardo, March 15, 1787." It is curious to find this ancient custom thus surviving with explicit regulation more than a century after the famous difficulty about this very point between Pope Innocent XI and Louis XIV. That it was something beyond a quaint relic is seen from an incident in the days of Bishop Tejada (1735-45). The Governor, Moral, had been superseded but he refused to give up his post and for a time even kept his successor, Justiz, from landing. Gradually, however, his supporters abandoned him, and, finding his position dangerous, he fled to the Franciscan Convent in St. Augustine and claimed the Right of Sanctuary. This claim was allowed by the new Governor, who refrained from arresting him until the Bishop had formally suspended the right, whereupon Moral gave himself up and was sent to Spain for trial.

By way of appendix and to round out the treatment of the subject we may insert here a few words on the other American possessions in this region before passing to the Southwest. These are Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Strictly speaking these districts do not belong to our present study, since Puerto Rico, though a separate diocese, is not in the American hierarchical system but is immediately subject to the Holy See; and the Virgin Islands are a part of the diocese of Roseau, the capital of the (British) island of Dominica. For these reasons a detailed account is not called for.

Puerto Rico.—This island, named by the natives Boriquen, was visited by Columbus on his second voyage on November 16, 1493, and named San Juan. For some years no settlement was attempted; in fact, the only time it was even visited was in 1498 and then by accident, when Vincenzo Yañez Pinzon was driven by storm to take refuge in the harbor of Aguada. In 1505, he obtained from Ferdinand a commission to colonize the island but failed through lack of assistance, so that the credit for establishing Spanish rule must go to the famous Ponce de Leon, at that time Governor of the eastern portion of Española. Having explored the island in 1508, he returned the following year and established a settlement at Caparra (the modern Pueblo Viejo), which served for a capital until 1519. Some priests were with him, but as this

was two years before the permanent establishment of dioceses in the West Indies, they must be considered as under the jurisdiction of Seville. As already narrated, one of the Sees established by Pope Julius II in 1511 was San Juan de Puerto Rico, and this included substantially the same territory that it includes today. The civil changes effected in 1519, including the transfer of the capital to San Juan, brought in their train certain ecclesiastical alterations, among others the extension of the diocesan territory to about half of the Lesser Antilles. Further extensions (in 1541 and 1588) gave the diocese the rest of this group and a considerable portion of what is now Venezuela; but the loss by Spain of these islands and the erection of the diocese of Guayana in Venezuela (1791) left to San Juan only Puerto Rico and the adjacent small islands of Vieques and Culebra. This territory passed to the United States by the Treaty of Paris in 1898.

At its foundation San Juan was a suffragan of Seville and so continued until San Domingo was elevated to the rank of an archdiocese in 1545, when San Juan was included in the new province. The Province of Santiago de Cuba, established in 1804, included Puerto Rico, and this arrangement lasted even after Puerto Rico had become American; for it was only in 1903 that Pope Pius X (by the Brief "Actum praeclare" of February 20) severed it from Santiago and made it immediately subject to the Holy See. The representative of Rome is the Apostolic Delegate to Cuba, not the Delegate to the United States.

The Virgin Islands.—These, the latest acquisition of the United States, were under the jurisdiction of Puerto Rico until the diocese of Guayana in Venezuela (a suffragan of Caracas) was formed in 1791, of which the Virgin Islands formed part. Despite political changes they continued to be subject to the Venezuelan bishop until 1820 when, at the request of the English Governor of Trinidad, the Catholics of the British possessions in those parts were withdrawn from the jurisdiction of Guayana and the Vicariate Apostolic of Port of Spain was formed. Geographical considerations led to the inclusion of the Danish West Indies (as they were known then) in this Vicariate until the Diocese of Roseau (capital of the British island of Dominica) was established as the suffragan of Port of Spain in 1850. Since

then the Bishop of Roseau has been the ecclesiastical ruler of the Virgin Islands, though the fact that they are now American and are much closer to Puerto Rico may lead to a further change.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

In addition to the bibliography given under the preceding article (CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, July, 1916, p. 146) we must include for the period here treated the Parish Registers of St. Augustine, which naturally assume the first importance. Though not published *in extenso* extracts have appeared, chiefly in Shea's *History of the Catholic Church in the United States*. Dr. Shea also drew largely on the *Noticias Relativas a la Iglesia Parroquial de San Augustin* (in MS.). I had hoped to add here information from certain unpublished sources in Florida but my efforts to obtain these have not been successful. I have spoken in the text of the article of Barcía's *Ensayo Cronologico para la Historia General de la Florida* (Madrid, 1723). Though of considerable value this work sometimes misleads by faulty chronology. An English translation was included in French's *Historical Collections of Louisiana* published in New York in 1846-53. The *Constituciones Synodales de la Iglesia de Cuba* were published at Santiago in 1682, and there is a second edition (without date). Of course this does not include the decrees of the Synod of 1684; they will be found published in a separate volume at Havana in 1842 (*Synodo Dioecesano que de Orden de S. M. celebro el Ilustrisimo Señor Doctor Don Juan García de Palacios . . . Reimpreso por Orden del . . . Segundo Obispo de la Habana:* Habana, Imprento del Gobierno). The part relating to Florida was printed in *The United States Catholic Historical Magazine*, Vol. i, pp. 287, *et seq.* In the same volume, p. 418, *et seq.*, will be found the *Instruccion para el Gobierno de los Parrocos de la Diocesi de la Luisiana* of Bishop Peñalver y Cardenas, with an English translation. I may add that the usual biographical dictionaries will be found of little, if any, assistance.

REV. EDWIN RYAN, D.D.,
Dunwoodie, New York.

NEW NETHERLAND INTOLERANCE

I

Henry Vignaud prints on the title page of his remarkable *Histoire Critique de la Grande Entreprise de Christophe Colomb* a wise saying of Herbert Spencer: "Demonstration fails to change established opinions." One would hardly expect proof of the saying in the official organ designed for the enlightenment of the school population of a great State. This is precisely what has been done by the University of the State of New York in its *Bulletin to the Schools*, October 15, 1915, which on that date lends itself to the dissemination of views that contravene the demonstrated truth. The University wishes to insist upon the history of the State in the schools of the State, and so reprints the views, that "Doctor Williams has restated for the benefit of the teachers and children of the State" at a recent meeting of the New York State Historical Association. In the cause of truth, exception must be taken to the last two of the first three paragraphs of the quotation from Dr. Williams, in which there are more historical errors than there are sentences.

"New York," he says, "was the only colony in which perfect religious liberty was to be had. This was always the case in our State except for a very short time under the rule of the strong, autocratic, masterful, and bigoted Stuyvesant, and he was not sustained in his acts either by the inhabitants of the colony or by the home government. The religious freedom established in New Netherland by Minuit and maintained ever since except for the brief period just mentioned made New York cosmopolitan, and New York City from the first has been 'a melting pot' of races.

"The New England Puritans came to this country to seek religious liberty for themselves, but not to allow it to others. The Dutch in New York granted it to every one. They had had it at home."

No historian today questions the importance of a correct view of the European background of our colonial history. The religious conditions of the mother country furnish the key to the right understanding of religion in New Netherland more than happens to be the case with almost any other colony. Yet

American historiography had persistently avoided clearness of definition on this fundamental point until the appearance of the doctoral dissertation, "Religion in New Netherland," offered by the writer to the University of Louvain.[1] Even then demonstration failed to change established opinion in the mind of my critic in the *American Historical Review* who was certainly ranked amongst the most judicious historians of the State of New York. The reply to my critic met with no rejoinder, but the hope expressed in its final sentence, that the demonstrated truth would at last now make its way into American historical literature,[2] is made vain, at least for an important section of the country, if all the school intelligence of the State of New York is to accept as truth the errors of Dr. Williams.

A list of the oppressive religious ordinances promulgated in the mother country establishes the fact that the Dutch had not religious liberty at home before or during the colonization of New Netherland. Typical is the placard promulgated by the States-General on the very eve of this colonization, Feb. 26, 1622, at the repeated request of the Ministers of the Dutch Reformed Church.[3] It prohibited Jesuits, religious of either sex, and foreign priests to reside permanently or temporarily in the Republic, under the penalty of being arrested as enemies of the State. A second offence on their part entailed punishment for disturbance of the public peace. Their hosts in the land were subject to a fine of one hundred pounds Flemish for the first offence, double the sum for the second offence, and to the penalty of corporal punishment and banishment for the third offence. Priests previously authorized to reside in the Republic were bound to report their names and places of residence to the local magistrates if they wished to continue in the enjoyment of this privilege. All correspondence with foreign ecclesiastics was prohibited to the subjects of the Republic, and letters of this kind were to be surrendered to the

[1] *American Historical Review*, October, 1911, p. 192, acknowledges "Religion in New Netherland" to be "the first serious attempt at interpretation of the religious development of the province of New Netherland in the light of modern research in the field of religious history of the mother country."

[2] *American Historical Review*, April, 1912, p. 683.

[3] WILTENS-SCHELTUS, *Kerkelyck Placaatboek*, Vol. i, pp. 544-554. "Jegens de Pausgesinde Geestelijckheyt, Conventiculen, Schoolen, Collecten, Kloppen, Vooghden, ende compositien der Officieren."

magistrates on their receipt under a fine of fifty pounds for every infraction of the law. Catholic ceremonies were interdicted not only in the churches but also in private houses. The master of the house was subject to a fine of two hundred florins, each person present to a fine of twenty-five florins, and the officiating priest to the penalty of banishment. The priests who preached disobedience to *these laws* were to be prosecuted for sedition and subjected to corporal punishment, "even to death," according to the gravity of the offence. Attendance at foreign Jesuit schools was forbidden, and parents were ordered to recall their children from such places under a fine of one hundred florins for each month of delay. The congregations of devout women, "klopjes," were to be dissolved at once. Protestant orphans were not to be confided to Catholic guardians, but to the care of the magistrate, if they had no near relation of the Reformed Faith. Collections for all sorts of Catholic purposes were absolutely interdicted. Finally the judges were commanded to execute the provisions of this ordinance without any relaxation, and they were threatened with the loss of their positions and with arbitrary punishment if they accepted a bribe from the delinquents. This was not an exceptional bit of legislation, but typical of ordinances adopted and more or less enforced from the promulgation of the first general placard against Catholics, December 20, 1581, and at intervals thereafter, even throughout the period of Dutch domination in New Netherland. This very placard of February 26, 1622, was renewed in 1624, 1629, and 1641. In fact, the States-General showed no willingness to abandon this policy of religious oppression. When a relaxation of the ordinances against Catholics was requested by Count d'Avaux, March 13, 1644, the States-General protested against this presumptuous intervention of a stranger in the internal affairs of the Republic. A resolution was then passed in the States-General to complete the penal legislation against Catholics on the specious plea that impunity to the propagation of "Catholic superstitions" and to the introduction of the papist hierarchy entailed undeniable dangers to public safety.[4] The clergy of the Reformed Church did not cease to

[4] Archives du Royaume à la Haye, Resolutien van H. H. M. de Staten generaal der Vereenigde Nederlanden, 1644, fo. 117 *sq.* in HUBERT, *Les Pays-Bas et la République des Provinces Unis. La Question Religieuse*, p. 81 *ff.*

clamor for more drastic measures against "popish idolatry, superstition, and hierarchy," etc., and they did not fail to receive some satisfaction from the government, though not always all that they desired.[5]

The oppressive measures of the States-General were often anticipated and even reinforced by the penal legislation of the provincial States, and even of the town councils. For instance; the States of Holland, March 12, 1591, placed a fine of three hundred florins on attendance at the Universities of Louvain, Dôle, and Douay, where instruction was contrary "to the true religion" and hostile to the Fatherland.[6] July 1, 1594, the same States placed a fine of one hundred pounds upon persons recurring to the ministry of a priest for the baptism of their children or for the celebration of marriage. A fine of fifty pounds was also placed on the witnesses and a fine of four hundred pounds on the persons instigating the act. The same penalties were decreed for attendance at papist conventicles.[7]

The Dutch Republic was evidently aiming at forcing a gradual extinction of Catholicity by a system of harassing measures that the magistrates, it is true, at times only held as a scourge over the heads of the Catholics, and which the Catholics at times were able to escape through the venality of the Dutch officials, subject to the national Dutch passion of the period-greed for money, as Fruin puts it.[8] Yet Fruin declares: "In our Republic the Catholic enjoyed, I repeat it, full freedom of conscience."[9] No more telling criticism can be found of this statement than the words of Dr. Knappert, which are a good summary, besides, of the religious policy of the Dutch Republic as revealed in its oppressive placards: "Also with us there was no place as yet for absolute freedom of conscience, and measured by our concept of the present day, Catholics had certainly no freedom . . . According to modern standards the policy was certainly oppressive. Although

---

[5] Cf. HUBERT, *op. cit., passim.* KNUTTEL, *De toestand der Nederl Katholieken ten tijde der Republiek.* DR. L. KNAPPERT, *De Verdraagzaamheid in de Republiek der Vereenigde Nederlanden.* Tijdspiegel, 1907.

[6] WILTENS-SCHELTUS, *Kerkelyck Placaatboek,* Vol i, p. 524.

[7] *Ibid.,* p. 528.

[8] FRUIN, *De Wederopluiking van het Katholicisme,* pp. 41–45.

[9] *Ibid.,* p. 36. Fruin still has many followers in this opinion.

different in various provinces, severer at one time than at another, it amounts, however, to this: Catholics had no equal rights before the law, could hold no public offices; they were personally unmolested in their religious convictions, but the common, public exercise of worship was not granted them, no Mass, no confirmation, no participation in pilgrimages; their sons could not study at foreign Catholic universities; their marriages had to be contracted before the Schout and Schepens, yes, in the Common Lands, for a time, even before the Reformed Preacher; here and there their children were even forced to attend the Reformed school, and their priests, as soon as they appeared in public, were punished with banishment and confiscation of their goods."[10] It is demonstrated, therefore, that the Dutch did not have religious liberty at home, and consequently there is no temptation to jump to the conclusion that the Dutch in New Netherland granted it to every one.

With this much established, the short notice given to "Religion in New Netherland" in the *English Historical Review* appears all the more surprising, although it is valuable as a manifestation of a school of criticism that has a footing in what one is otherwise prone to believe a judicious circle of historians. "The main purpose of the book seems to be to prove that the Dutch in the New World, as in the Old, were by no means the enlightened, tolerant people that they are generally represented. Mr. Zwierlein as *a Roman Catholic may be suspected of some bias*; but his conclusions are based on a very large amount of documentary material."[11] The author had only one purpose in view. "Nam quis nescit primam esse historiae legem, ne quid falsi dicere audeat? deinde ne quid veri non audeat? ne qua suspicio sit gratiae in scribendo? ne qua simultas? Haec scilicet funda-

[10] KNAPPERT, *De Verdraagzaamheid in de Republiek der Vereenigde Nederlanden*, p. 248. Other dissenters besides Catholics were subject to persecution. Cf., *e. g.*, BRANDT, *Hist. d. Reformatie*, Vol. ii, p. 14 *ff.*, for placard directed not only against Catholics but also Anabaptists by States of Groningen. On persecution of more liberal party amongst Dutch Reformed, Arminians or Remonstrants, after Synod of Dordrecht; cf. BLOK, *A History of the People of the Netherlands*, Vol. iii, p. 483 *ff.*, and oppressive placards in WILTENS-SCHELTUS, *Kerkelyck Placaatboek*.

[11] *English Historical Review*, October, 1910 (Vol. xxv), p. 821. [The italics are ours.] This principle of historical criticism has not found a place in books of historical method, but it is found often in historical reviews.

menta nota sunt omnibus."[12] It is peculiar that the European critic has no difficulty apparently in accepting the truth regarding the Dutch in Europe, but questions it in case of the Dutch in America, while the American critic accepts without trouble as true the account of religious persecution by the Dutch in America, but questions the truth in regard to the Dutch in Europe.

Almost from the very beginning the Dutch Reformed Church appears as the established church of New Netherland. While no mention is made of religion in the charter of the West India Company,[13] or in the subsequent agreement between the managers and the principal adventurers,[14] the matter was soon brought to the attention of its general executive board, the College of the XIX, by a deputation of the Consistory of Amsterdam, which was instructed, August 20, 1623, to recommend the furthering of church service on sea as well as on land.[15] The College of the XIX thanked the Consistory for its solicitude and declared readiness to act accordingly, although there could be no thought of the establishment of a seminary for young students as had been suggested, before the affairs of the Company were better ordered and settled.[16] The Directors of the West India Company then agreed to grant a salary to those whom they accepted as fit persons on the recommendation of the Church as long as they were in the country, in order to have them work the better.[17] Accordingly Bastiaen Jansz. Krol was commissioned at the end of 1623 to sail to New Netherland to exercise there the office of Comforter of the Sick, for which he had been presented to the West India Company by the Consistory of Amsterdam.[18] In the fall of 1624, he was authorized to baptize and marry, functions not generally allowed Comforters of the Sick, but the concession was necessary as the number of inhabitants was too small for a minister to be sent there

---

[12] CICERO, *De Orat.*, Vol. ii, p. 15.

[13] Cf. Charter in O'CALLAGHAN, *History of New Netherland*, Vol. i, p. 399 *ff.* VAN RENSSELAER-BOWIER MSS., edited by A. S. VAN LAER, gives a revised version of the charter.

[14] Cf., Agreement in O'CALLAGHAN, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 408 *ff.*

[15] Protocollen van den Kerkeraad van Amsterdam V, fol. 129 in EEKHOF, *Baestian Jansz. Krol. Bijlagen*, p. XX *ff.*

[16] Protoc. V, fol. 131, *ibid.*, p. XXI.

[17] Protoc. V, fol. 138, September 28, 1623; *ibid.*, p. XXI *ff.*

[18] Protoc. V, fol. 157, December 7, 1623, *ibid.*, p. XXII.

as requested by them.[19] Although still another Comforter of the Sick was sent them in the Spring of 1626 in the person of Jan Hughens,[20] the people had not the consolation of receiving a minister till the Spring of 1628, when Rev. Jonas Michaelius landed in New Netherland the 7th of April. He soon organized a consistory, consisting of himself, the Director General Peter Minuit, Jan Hughens, the latter's brother-in-law and the Company's storekeeper, and Jans Krol. The Consistory of Amsterdam still had the immediate supervision over this colonial church, to the support of whose minister the Directors of the Company were "indebted . . . for as much as the value of a free table."[21] Thus the Dutch Reformed Church was as much the established Church in the colony as in the mother country.

When the Company in 1629 granted to its members, who might plant colonies in New Netherland, a charter of privileges and exemptions, guaranteeing feudal rights to such patroons, including also liberal privileges for private persons in the United Provinces, who should settle there, it was most natural, under these circumstances, to insert the twenty-seventh article: "*The Patroons and colonists shall in particular, and in the speediest manner, endeavor to find out ways and means, whereby they may support a Minister and schoolmaster, that thus the service of God and zeal for religion may not grow cool and be neglected among them, and they shall from the first procure a Comforter of the Sick there.*"[22] Thus the maintenance of the ministry of the Reformed Church was made obligatory on the part of the patroons and colonists. Precisely at the time of the negotiation of this charter, the West India Company was anxious to appear in the light of the champion of the Dutch national cause and faith, as the directors feared the successful conclusion of a truce with Spain to the great

---

[19] Protoc. V., fol. 231, November 14, 1624, and November 21, 1624, *ibid.*, p. XXIII.

[20] Protoc. V., fol. 336, April 2, 1626, *ibid.*

[21] JAMESON, *Narratives of New Netherland*, pp. 122–133.

[22] *Col. Docs., N. Y.*, Vol. ii, pp. 551–7. *Laws and Ordinances of New Netherland*, p. 9. The provision of the charter was not a piece of legislation adopted in particular for New Netherland, but is also found in the draft of the conditions for colonies in general by the College of the XIX, June 12, 1627 and November 22, 1628. *Cf.* Extract from Dutch Archives, U. S. Commission on Boundary between Venezuela and British Guiana, Vol. ii, pp. 52, 63.

detriment of the interests of the Company, whose members, according to their remonstrance, had "most at heart the maintenance of the Reformed Religion and the liberties of our beloved Fatherland."[23] Minuit's administration as Director General, therefore, saw the establishment of a fully organized Reformed Church, subsidized by the West India Company, which then imposed on new patroons and colonists the obligation of supporting the Reformed Church service.[24] The documents furnish the evidence of this, but not of the establishment of religious freedom in New Netherland by Peter Minuit.

The privileged position of the Dutch Reformed Church in New Netherland was not in any way menaced till a change in the colonial policy of the West India Company, in the fall of 1638, abolished the monopoly of the fur trade, opened to free competition also the other internal trade of New Netherland to colonists of the Province, and extended these privileges, not only to the inhabitants of the United Provinces, but also to their allies and friends who might be inclined to sail thither to engage in the cultivation of the land.[25] The States-General, under whose pressure the change had been effected, hoped thus for an increase of the population of the Province to avert all danger of its loss through foreign invasion. Conditions resulting from this change of colonial policy made a new charter necessary, which the States-General did not cease to demand from the Company. At the same time the patroons made an unsuccessful attempt to obtain greater independence from the Company and a greater restriction of private enterprise in the colony. This was the burden of the New Projet of colonization which they submitted to the States-General.[26] The West India Company itself also submitted a draft of articles and conditions which were to regulate the future colonization and trade of New Netherland. The directors recognized the importance of establishing the proper order of public worship in the first commencement and planting of the population according to the practice established by the govern-

[23] West India Co.'s Consideration on a truce with Spain, November 16, 1629. *Col. Docs., N. Y.*, Vol. i, pp. 40–2.

[24] Cf. result in the only successful patroonship established, Rennselaerswyck, in F. J. Zwierlein, *Religion in New Netherland*, p. 73.

[25] O'Callaghan, *History of New Netherland*, Vol. i, 200–3.

[26] *Ibid*, Vol. i, p. 198.

ment of the Netherlands. Although religion was to be taught and preached in the Province of New Netherland "according to the confession and formularies of unity . . . publicly accepted in the respective churches" of the fatherland, no person was thereby to be "in any wise constrained or aggrieved in his conscience," but every person was to be "free to live in peace and all decorum, provided he take care not to frequent forbidden assemblies or conventicles, much less collect or get up any such; and further abstain from all public scandals and offences which the magistrate is charged to prevent by all fitting reproofs and admonitions, and, if necessary, to advise the Company from time to time of what may occur there herein, so that confusion and misunderstanding may be timely obviated and prevented." The Company then defined the religious duties of the inhabitants still more in detail. Every inhabitant was bound not only to fulfill his civic duties, but also to attend faithfully to any religious charge that he might receive in the churches, without any claim to a recompense. Further, each inhabitant and householder was to bear such tax and public charge as would be considered proper for the maintenance of preachers, Comforters of the Sick, schoolmasters, and similar necessary officers.[27]

This charter with the New Project was sent to the Chamber of the West India Company, which was to consider the entire case of New Netherland with the deputies of the States-General.[28] However, no definite results were obtained till the States-General threatened to grant a charter independent of the Company, if the Directors failed to submit one for approval and ratification.[29] Finally, on July 19, 1640, the new charter of Freedoms and Exemptions was promulgated, of which "all good inhabitants of the Netherlands and all others inclined to plant any colonies in New Netherland" might take advantage. The phraseology of this revised charter in regard to religion is much less liberal in tone than the articles that had been proposed before by the Company. The subjection of the Church to the civil authority, which is expressed in all Confessions of the Reformed Churches, also found its expression in this charter. It reserved to the

[27] Cf. Arts. 6 and 8, *Col. Docs., N. Y.*, Vol. i, p. 112.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 114.
[29] Proceedings of States-General, May 31, 1640, *Col. Docs., N. Y.*, Vol. i, p. 118.

Company the founding of churches, and to the Governor and Council the cognizance of all cases of religion.[30] The decree renewing the establishment of the Dutch Reformed Church in a negative form emphasizes the hostile spirit of the new constitution of the country toward dissent: "*And no other religion shall be publicly admitted in New Netherland except the Reformed, as it is at present preached and practiced by public authority in the United Netherlands: and for this purpose the Company shall provide and maintain good and suitable preachers, schoolmasters, and comforters of the sick.*"[31]

The charter with this clause was promulgated seven years before the arrival in the country of Peter Stuyvesant as Director General, when that important office was held by his predecessor, William Kieft. This express denial of religious liberty did not, however, prevent New Amsterdam from becoming "a melting pot of races," since the charter occasioned the immigration of many foreigners into the colony because of other advantages. This also caused an increase of dissent, against which this clause seems to have been intended for the purpose of strengthening the position of the Dutch Reformed Church in its exclusive privilege as the established Colonial Church. Both the cosmopolitan character of New Amsterdam and the lack of religious freedom were noticed by Father Jogues in the days of William Kieft: "On this Island of Manhate and its environs there may well be four or five hundred men of different sects and nations. The Director General told me that there were persons there of eighteen different languages." Although the Dutch were very generous in their treatment of Father Jogues and later of other Jesuit missionaries,[32] they were evidently bent on impressing him with the idea that dissenters from the established religion were only present on the sufferance of the local authorities, as he had been informed, in all likelihood, by the Director General himself that the colony had "orders to admit none but Calvinists." It may be that Father Jogues misunderstood the matter, and that the orders referred to by his informant were nothing else than the clause of the charter prohibiting dissenting

[30] Cf. two last Arts. of *Freedoms and Exemptions*, *ibid.*, p. 123.

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] Cf. ZWIERLEIN, *Religion in New Netherland*, pp. 276–316.

worship. However, the Jesuit had observed that there were, "besides Calvinists in the colony, Catholics, English, Puritans, Lutherans, Anabaptists, here called Mnistes, etc."[33] Ten years later, after the arrival of Stuyvesant, the diversity of religious opinion is still more emphasized in the remonstrance which Domine Megapolensis sent to the Classis of Amsterdam as a protest against the admission of Jews into the Province of New Netherland. "For as we have here Papists, Mennonites, and Lutherans among the Dutch; also many Puritans or Independents, and many atheists, and various servants of Baal among the English under this government who conceal themselves under the name of Christians; it would create still greater confusion, if the obstinate and immoveable Jews came to settle here."[34]

While it was a matter of life and death for the colony of New Netherland to resist the encroachments of New England governments, Kieft seems to have welcomed the occasion to treat with some families from Lynn and Ipswich for their settlement under Dutch jurisdiction in 1641. The Director General no doubt thought that settlements of Englishmen, bound by an oath of allegiance to the States-General and to the West India Company, would prove a good barrier to further encroachments of New England governments. The English were, therefore, permitted to settle in Dutch territory on equal terms with the other colonists of the Province[35] in accordance with the provisions of the charter of 1640, which became the basis of all future grants from the Dutch to the English. This guaranteed them practically "the very same liberties, both ecclesiastical and civil, which they enjoyed in the Massachusetts."[36] They were not granted, as some historians seem to think, freedom of religion, but freedom of *their* religion. The pronoun is essential and saves the "fair terms" to the English from being a violation of the colonial charter just promulgated by the West India Company. Both the Dutch and the New England English felt that their religion

[33] *Doc. Hist., N. Y.*, Vol. iv, p. 15; *Jes. Rel.*, Vol. ix.

[34] *Eccl. Recs., N. Y.*, Vol. i, p. 336.

[35] *Col. Docs., N. Y.*, Vol. i, p. 181; Vol. xiii, p. 8.

[36] *Winthrop's Journal*, Vol. ii, p. 35 (ed. *Original Narratives of Early American History*).

did not differ "in fundamentals." The consciousness of the "close union and congruity of the divine service of the two nations" found expression even in the year in which these fair terms were offered to the English of Ipswich and Lynn. The Reverend Mr. Hugh Peters of Salem, who was sent to England to negotiate with Parliament in regard to New England affairs, was also instructed to go, if possible, to the Netherlands to treat with the West India Company for a peaceable neighborhood with its colony of New Netherland. According to the fifth article of the propositions which he was to submit to the Company in the name of Massachusetts and Connecticut, he was to request "that the company, knowing that the English in America amount to about fifty thousand souls, may be pleased to inform us in what manner we can be employed in advancing the great work there, being of the same religion with themselves."[37] This feeling of solidarity in religion was also manifested by the Dutch in the Netherlands. When the Dutch heard that the Westminster Assembly "had agreed upon a certain plan of church government, practically the same in most points as that of the Reformed Church of this country, and had laid the same before the Parliament of England . . . for approval," they experienced great gladness and singular "satisfaction" in "the assurance that between the English Church and our Church there should be effected a similar form of government."[38] Even the triumph of Independency over Presbyterianism in England did not change this friendly feeling of the Dutch toward the English Puritans. Upon the Restoration, the States-General of the United Provinces permitted "all Christian people of tender conscience in England and elsewhere, oppressed, full liberty to erect a colony in the West Indies between New England and Virginia in America . . . on the conditions and privileges granted by the committees of the respective chambers representing the Assembly of the XIX . . . Therefore, if any of the English, *good Christians* . . . shall be rationally disposed to transport themselves to the said place under the conduct of the United States (they) shall have full liberty to live in the fear of the Lord."[39] Thus both English

[37] *Col. Docs., N. Y.*, Vol. ii, p. 150.
[38] Synods of North and South Holland, *Eccl. Records, N. Y.*, Vol. i, p. 192.
[39] *Doc. Hist., N. Y.*, Vol. iii, pp. 37–39.

Congregationalists and English Presbyterians found a welcome in New Netherland, although the authorities, civil and ecclesiastical, of the Province naturally favored the latter, whose agreement with the Reformed Church was not limited to "fundamentals," but also extended to church polity in detail.

Early in 1642, the Reverend Francis Doughty, Presbyterian minister, as agent for some English residing at Rhode Island, at Cohannock, and other places, negotiated with the Director General and Council a patent for a settlement at Mespath on Long Island that they might "according to the *Dutch Reformation* enjoy freedom of conscience."[40] Kieft readily granted Doughty and his associates freedom of conscience *according to the Dutch Reformation* in the clause of the Mespath patent, which gave them power "to exercise the *Reformed* Christian Religion and church discipline which they profess.[41] In the autumn of the same year, John Throghmorton, asked Kieft for permission to settle under his jurisdiction with thirty-five families and to live in peace, "provided they be allowed to enjoy the same privileges as other subjects and to freely exercise *their* religion." The following summer, the patent was issued for the territory that he and his companions had occupied, but it makes no mention of religion.[42] In the Spring of 1644, another English colony of Presbyterians settled on Long Island under the Dutch jurisdiction. They had sent a committee there in 1643 to purchase lands from the Indians. Early in the following year, the English were settled "in the great plain, which is called Hempstead, where Mr. Fordham, an English minister, had the rule."[43] The reference to Mr. Fordham very likely is due to his civil position in the new settlement, as the ministerial office was not then exercised by him, but by Richard Denton, who is later described by the Dutch ministers of New Amsterdam as "sound in the faith, of a friendly disposition, and beloved by all."[44] It is not strange, therefore, that the settlement of Hempstead received a patent

[40] *Col. Docs., N. Y.*, Vol. i, pp. 424–31.

[41] *Book of Patents GG*, p. 49; RIKER, *Annals of Newtown*, p. 413; O'CALLAGHAN, *History of New Netherland*, Vol. i, p. 425.

[42] *Col. Docs., N. Y.*, Vol. xiii, p. 10.

[43] Broad Advice, *N. Y. Hist. Soc. Col.*, 2d Ser., Vol. iii, p. 257 (1857). In 1642 Lechford speaks of him as a minister out of office.

[44] *Eccl. Records, N. Y.*, Vol. i, p. 410.

with the same religious provisions as were contained in the patent of Mespath. Thus the settlers received full power and authority "to exercise the *Reformed* religion, which they profess, with the ecclesiastical discipline thereunto belonging.[45] On the termination of the disastrous Indian war in 1645, two more English settlements on Long Island succeeded in obtaining a charter. This was evidently formulated by the patentees to avoid a recurrence of New England persecution, to which they had been subjected prior to their removal to New Netherland. At this time Kieft was ready to make any possible concession that would attract new settlers and retain in the country the old inhabitants, for there was no hope for the improvement of the Dutch Province without an increase of its population seriously reduced in the Indian war. The settlers of these towns apparently were not considered within the pale of the Reformed Church, and so the Director General was not in a position to grant them the exercise of the Reformed Religion, which alone could be publicly practiced according to the constitutional charter of the Freedoms and Exemptions of 1640. Consequently all that he could do, was to grant them "Liberty of Conscience," which was further defined as freedom from "molestacon or disturbance from any Magistrate or Magistrates, or any other Ecclesiastical Minister, that may extend jurisdiction over them." A precedent for this concession was found in "the Customs and manner of Holland"' The settlers of the town of Flushing were the first to receive this concession in their charter. A few months later Gravesend received a charter with the same provision.[46]

Peter Stuyvesant's religious policy towards English settlements of this kind under Dutch jurisdiction was neither more nor less liberal than that of his predecessor, for the simple reason that the conduct of both in the matter was regulated by the charter of 1640. Thus in 1652, some New England settlers with some individuals from Hempstead obtained permission from Stuyvesant to plant a new colony in the vicinity of the old settlement on land not yet occupied, which was, therefore, commonly

[45] Patent, November 16, 1644, printed in THOMPSON, *History of Long Island*, Vol. ii, p. 5.

[46] Laws and Ordinances of New Netherland, *New York Deed Book*, Vol. ii, p. 178; WALLER, *History of Flushing*; Appendix, *Doc. Hist., N. Y.*, Vol. i, p. 411.

known as Newtown, although its official name was Middelburg. The patent granted them the free exercise of *their* Protestant religion.[47] Some of the inhabitants were Presbyterians, but the great majority of them were Independents.[48] In 1655, a settlement of English in Westchester was brought under Dutch jurisdiction and called by the Dutch Ostdorp. The inhabitants were Independents, and so there was no reason to disturb their religious worship.[49] There was likewise no interference with the religion of Jamaica, settled in 1656 mostly from Hempstead and called by the Dutch Rustdorp, as long as it was a question of the Reformed worship.[50] Most significant, however, are the long negotiations for the establishment of a settlement between some prospective New Haven settlers and Peter Stuyvesant, which illustrate most clearly the New Netherland attitude towards the "New England Way." The demands of the English are well put in their proposal, dated November 8, 1661, at Milford, N. E. They were evidently bent on transferring all their civil and ecclesiastical institutions to the projected settlement. The newly planted church or churches of the English were "to enjoy all such powers, privileges and liberties in the Congregational way as they have enjoyed in New England . . . without any disturbance, impediment or impositions of any other forms, orders or customs." They insisted that this approval of their churches be acknowledged by some public testimony upon record.[51] Thus far they had asked for nothing that had not already been conceded to others in the Dutch Province, because there was "no difference in the fundamental points of the worship of God betwixt (the Dutch churches) and the churches of New England as only in the Rueling of the same."[52] The church polity of the former was Presbyterian, while that of the latter was Congregational. However now the Provincial government was asked not only to allow a corporate existence to individual churches, but also to allow these English churches planted under the Dutch government "to consociate together for mutual helpfulness," to call a Synod and

[47] RIKER, *Annals of Newtown*, p. 40.
[48] *Eccl. Recs., N. Y.*, Vol. i, p. 396.
[49] *Ibid.*; cf. *Doc. Hist., N. Y.*, Vol. iii, p. 557.
[50] Cf. ZWIERLEIN, *Religion in New Netherland*, p. 176.
[51] *Col. Docs., N. Y.*, Vol. xiii, p. 208.
[52] Stuyvesant to Milford, November 28, 1661, *Col. Docs., N. Y.*, Vol. xiii, p. 210.

establish "by common consent such orders according to scripture as may be requisite for the suppressing of hairesies, schismes and false worships and for the establishment of truth with peace." Stuyvesant was willing to make all possible concessions, again adverting to the fact "that there is noe at the least differency in the fundamentall points of religion, the differency in churches orders and governments so small that wee doe not stick at it, therefore have left and leave still to the freedome off your owne consciences."[53] He even granted them full liberty to plant churches in the Congregational way and to organize them into a Synod.[54] The projected settlement, however, was not realized until after the English conquest of New Netherland, at Milford, soon changed to Newark.[55]

II

The rise of organized dissent within New Netherland was a by-product of the immigration resulting from the concessions of the charter of the Freedoms and Exemptions of 1640. Yet it contained the prohibition of the public worship of any other religion than the Reformed. The issue, however, was not raised till the administration of Stuyvesant when efforts were made for the first time to organize dissenting worship, especially by Lutherans and Quakers. Both consequently found themselves exposed to persecution,[56] which extended also to Jews for fear that they also might be tempted to do the same. Of course there were also economic reasons that inspired the repression of the Jews.[57] No one disputes the fact of these persecutions, but there is considerable unwillingness to have any one else than Stuyvesant share the responsibility for the same. Nevertheless it was the clergy of the Reformed Church at New Amsterdam that petitioned for the intervention of Stuyvesant when "inhabitants and unqualified persons ventured to hold conventicles and gatherings and assumed to teach the Gospel" in Newtown. The ministers feared that this bad example would find imitation and result in quarrels, confusion, and disorders in Church and com-

[53] Same to same, March 11, 1662, *ibid.*, p. 216.
[54] *Ibid.*, p. 281.
[55] Cf. FISKE, *Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America*, Vol. ii, pp. 12–15.
[56] ZWIERLEIN, *Religion in New Netherland*, pp. 187–246.
[57] *Ibid.*, pp. 247–265.

monalty.[58] They could rely upon the Director General's good offices in the matter, as they had already obtained, in answer to their remonstrance against the petition of the Lutherans for the public exercise of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, the assurance that "he would rather relinquish his office than grant permission in this matter, since it is contrary to the first article of his commission, which was confirmed by him with an oath, not to permit any other than the Reformed Doctrine."[59] Stuyvesant now expressed his decision to have placards issued against those persons, who, without either ecclesiastical or secular authority, acted as teachers in interpreting and expounding God's Holy Word. Stuyvesant also felt that this was a violation of the political and ecclesiastical rules of the fatherland, and an occasion for an outbreak of heresy and schism. Consequently all such conventicles, both public and private, were prohibited under heavy penalties in the ordinance of February 1, 1656.[60]

Although the ordinance legislated for the repression of the freedom of religious worship in conventicles not within the pale of the Reformed Church, the Director General and Council were careful to include the more liberal provisions of the "Articles" that had been presented by John de Laet in the name of the West India Company to the States General for their approval. They did not "hereby intend to force the conscience of any to the prejudice of formerly given patents." This can only refer to the patents of Flushing and Gravesend, which grant "Liberty of conscience according to the Custome and manner of Holland, without molestacon or disturbance from any Magistrate or Magistrates, or any other ecclesiastical minister, that may extend jurisdiccon over them." Stuyvesant's interpretation of this liberty of conscience did not include freedom of worship either in public or private conventicles. However, he expressly stated that he had no desire to invade the sanctuary of the home with this legislation, which did not affect "the reading of God's Holy Word, family prayers and worship, *each in his own house*." Thus the ordinance distinguished three kinds of worship: (1) Worship in

---

[58] *Eccl. Recs., N. Y.*, Vol. i, p. 410.

[59] *Eccl. Recs., N. Y.*, Vol. i, p. 318.

[60] *Records* of New Amsterdam, Vol. i, p. 20; Vol. ii, p. 34; *Eccles. Records, N. Y.*, Vol. i, p. 343.

public conventicles; (2) worship in private conventicles, and (3) worship within the family. The last was all that was allowed those that were not adherents of the Reformed Religion. This precisely constituted "Liberty of conscience according to the custome and manner of Holland."[61] The publication and execution of the ordinance was entrusted to the fiscal and inferior magistrates and schouts throughout New Netherland, and its presence in town records shows the fidelity with which these orders were fulfilled.[62] In this way the Director General and Council believed that they had made ample provision for "the glory of God, the promotion of the Reformed Religion, and public peace, harmony, and welfare."

Nevertheless a Lutheran minister came to New Amsterdam to organize Lutheran worship there. The event called forth a vigorous protest from the Dutch clergy of the town, who summarized, in a remonstrance of six points[63] directed to the Burgomasters and Schepens, the injurious consequences of the exercise of the Lutheran confession not only to the religious, but also to the political interests of this place, as the strife in religious matters resulting therefrom would produce confusion in political matters and thus a united and peaceful people would be transformed into a Babel of confusion.[64] The ministers no doubt had in mind the colony of Rhode Island, which they regarded as the cess-pool of New England, full of erring spirits and enthusiasts.[65] The Burgomasters and Schepens could not believe that the directors of the West India Company, whom the Lutheran preacher represented as favorable to Lutheran worship, would tolerate any other than the true Reformed in this place, inasmuch as the oath of office "to help maintain the true Reformed Religion and to suffer no other religion or sects," had been approved by these directors. The Lutheran minister was accordingly forbidden to hold any public or private conventicles, and the proceedings were

---

[61] Cf. HUBERT, *Les Pays-Bas Espagnols et La République des Provinces Unies, La Question Religieuse*, p. 97.

[62] Het Bouk Van Het Durp Utrecht, Aô, 1657, *Hall of Records*, Kings County, Brooklyn.

[63] *Eccl. Recs., N. Y.*, Vol. i, pp. 386–88.

[64] *Ibid.*

[65] *Ibid.*, Vol. i, p. 400.

reported to the Director General and Council, who commended in every particular the action taken and ordered the strict enforcement of the ordinance of February 1, 1656, against conventicles, as this was "necessary for the maintenance and conservation, not only of the Reformed divine service, but also of political and civil peace, quietness, and harmony."[66] The Dutch ministers did not rest easy till the Lutheran preacher was transported from the colony.

Throughout the agitation there was no lack of support on the part of the Classis of Amsterdam, the ecclesiastical authority of the Colonial Church in the Fatherland. It was even less tolerant of ecclesiastical differences than the ministers in the colony.[67] In their eyes the concession of the freedom of religious worship to the Lutherans would entail the concession of a similar privilege to the Mennonites and English Independents, and even to the Jews, who had in fact made this request of the governor and had "also attempted to erect a synagogue for the exercise of their blasphemous religion."[68] The Classis expressed, with deep emotion, its realization of the fact that under such circumstances a pastor's work would have greatly increased and his path would have been beset with obstacles and difficulties, which would interfere with a minister's good and holy efforts for the extension of the cause of Christ. Under the influence of the Classis of Amsterdam, the directors of the West India Company also classed with the Mennonites the English Independents amongst those who might urge claims for the freedom of religious worship upon the concession of such a privilege to the Lutherans. Some uneasiness was experienced in regard to the States of Holland who might be inclined to grant the Lutheran petition, but these fears of the Classis were set at rest by the promise which the directors of the West India Company gave to resist any such concession.[69] In this matter, the decision of the company was pronounced finally, February 23, 1654, when the directors resolved not to tolerate any Lutheran pastors there, nor any other public worship than the

[66] *Eccl. Recs., N. Y.*, Vol. i, p. 390.

[67] The right of English Independents to public worship was never disputed by either Stuyvesant or the ministers of New Amsterdam.

[68] *Eccl. Recs., N. Y.*, Vol. i, p. 348.

[69] *Ibid.*, Vol. i, p. 322.

true Reformed. The Classis of Amsterdam was perfectly satisfied and did not doubt but that henceforth the Reformed Doctrine "would be maintained without being hindered by the Lutherans and other erring spirits."[70] When the directors of the Company announced to Stuyvesant their absolute denial of the Lutheran petition, "pursuant to the customs hitherto observed by us and the East India Company," they recommended him to deny all similar petitions, but "in the most civil and least offensive way, and to employ all possible but moderate means in order to induce them to listen, and finally join the Reformed Church, and thus live in greater love and harmony."[71]

When the Lutherans in Amsterdam again interceded in behalf of their fellow believers in New Netherland, and rumors were rife of permission to be granted by the directors of the West India Company and the City of Amsterdam "to all sorts of persuasions . . . to exercise their special forms of worship" in their respective colonies,[72] the Classis of Amsterdam immediately directed its deputies on Indian affairs to wait upon these directors and magistrates of Amsterdam and insist on the "injuriousness of the general permission of all sorts of persuasions."[73] When another petition from the New Netherland Lutherans reached the directors of the company, the Classis again instructed these deputies "with all serious arguments . . . to check, at the beginning, this toleration of all sorts of religions, and especially of the Lutherans, lest God's Church come to suffer more and more injury as time goes on."[74] The deputies of the Classis soon learned that the directors of the West India Company had in fact resolved to connive at the free exercise of dissenting worship. Their representations against the adoption of this religious policy influenced the directors finally to abide by the resolution of the previous year.[75] The petitioners were told that the concession of religious worship to the Lutherans exceeded the powers of the West India Company and depended on the States-General, to

---

[70] *Ibid.*, Vol. i, p. 323.
[71] *Col. Docs., N. Y.*, Vol. xiv, p. 250.
[72] *Eccl. Recs., N. Y.*, Vol. i, p. 357.
[73] *Ibid.*, Vol. i, p. 360.
[74] *Ibid.*, Vol. i, p. 372.
[75] *Ibid.*, Vol. i, p. 375.

whom they were referred.[76] The deputies were not so successful with the burgomasters of the City of Amsterdam, from whom they could only extort the indefinite promise that they would attend to the matter at the proper time, when information should arrive that the sects carried on the exercise of their religions. The magistrates of Amsterdam declared that they could not force the consciences of men, and the ministers denied that this was the purpose of their intervention. Under these circumstances, the Classis, not feeling entirely at ease, resolved to encourage "the consistory in New Netherland to continue their good zeal to check these evils in every possible way; diligence and labor are required to prevent false opinions and foul heresies from becoming prejudicial to the pure truth." This is also the burden of the letter,[77] which the Classis of Amsterdam sent the consistory of New Netherland, to introduce the Reverend Everardus Welius, the first minister to the city's colony of New Amstel. They were justified in their feeling of anxiety when they learned of the departure of a Lutheran minister, whose final expulsion from the colony of New Netherland must have been as great a relief to them as to the colonial clergy. Meanwhile the Classis saw the inconsistency of the concession of freedom of worship to the Swedish Lutherans on the South River and of its denial to the Dutch Lutherans on the North River at New Amsterdam. The ministers therefore resolved that the directors were to be urged to correct this abuse in the territory of the West India Company and the burgomasters requested to instruct their vice-director Alrichs to oppose the Lutherans and other sects in the district subject to the authority of the City of Amsterdam.[78] Both promised to be on their guard, and not permit, but rather endeavor to prevent the public exercise of the Lutheran worship.[79] Stuyvesant,

[76] *Ibid.*, Vol. i, p. 378. Stuyvesant was officially informed that the Lutherans were given no more liberty in their worship than "the permission quietly to have their exercises at their houses." *Col. Docs., N. Y.*, Vol. xiv, pp. 386-388. The Classis observed: "We cannot interprete this in any other way than that every one must have freedom to serve God quietly within his dwelling in such manner as his religion may prescribe, without instituting any public conventicles or gatherings. When this interpretation is recognised, our complaints will cease."

[77] *Eccl. Recs., N. Y.*, Vol. i, p. 378.

[78] *Ibid.*, Vol. i, p. 377.

[79] *Ibid.*, Vol. i, p. 382.

nevertheless, faithfully fulfilled the stipulation of the treaty with the Swedes, which guaranteed them freedom of Lutheran worship even after the conquest of New Sweden, and there is no evidence that the clergy of New Amsterdam made any attempt to change his policy in this regard.[80] The Classis was gratified with better results from the commissioners of the City's colony, who, August 22, 1659, resented "the bold undertaking of the Swedish parson to preach there in the colony without permission," and ordered the vice-director "by proper means to put an end to or prevent such presumption on the part of other sectaries," because "as yet no other religion but the Reformed can or may be tolerated there."[81]

While the directors of the West India Company maintained the exclusive privilege of the Dutch Reformed Church in New Netherland, they tried to make some concessions to the Lutherans by ordering the administration of baptism according to an older but admitted form. Now the ministers of the colony again found earnest support and encouragement in their opposition from the Classis of Amsterdam, but the directors persisted in their demands,[82] and manifested so much displeasure, that the deputies of the Classis on Indian affairs delayed addressing them on the subject until further correspondence with the brethren in New Netherland.[83] The directors were not satisfied with the fact that the Lutherans were now again taking part in the divine service of the Reformed Church; they wished to exclude any possibility of another separation, that might arise if they should continue such precise forms and expressions, as the Lutherans could very easily obtain from the authorities in the Fatherland the right of organizing separate Divine Service, which the directors would then be powerless to prevent. Stuyvesant was, therefore, again directed, December 29, 1659, to admonish

[80] This fact should not be forgotten by those historians who wish to throw all the responsibility for the policy of religious repression on Stuyvesant. It is all the more noteworthy since the concession to the Swedes was due to the force of circumstances at the time of the conquest.

[81] *Col. Docs., N. Y.*, Vol. ii, p. 61. However the official orthodoxy of the New Amstel began to give way in 1662 to the urgent necessity of obtaining colonists to repel English encroachments from Maryland. Cf. ZWIERLEIN, *Religion in New Netherland*, p. 130.

[82] *Eccl. Recs., N. Y.*, Vol. i, p. 440; *Col. Docs., N. Y.*, Vol. xiv, p. 429.

[83] *Eccl. Recs., N. Y.*, Vol. i, p. 442.

the ministers to employ the old formula of baptism without waiting for further orders from the Classis of Amsterdam. Thus all dissensions in the Church and State of New Netherland would cease.[84] The directors of the Company had lost patience "with scruples about unnecessary forms, which cause more division than edification." Before their departure from Holland, the directors gave to two newly appointed preachers for New Netherland books containing the old formula which they had to promise to use in the exercise of their clerical office.[85] When Megapolensis and Drisius, the two ministers at New Amsterdam, learned this, they also resolved to use the old formula, prescribed by the directors, "with the design of avoiding any division in the churches of the country."[86]

One of the points made against the concession of Lutheran worship was the consequent necessity of also giving liberty of worship to the Jews, who had forced their way into the colony in spite of the opposition of Stuyvesant. The directors of the Amsterdam Chamber confessed their desire to exclude the Jews, but they were sorely in need of Jewish capital, and so had to allow Jewish immigration into New Netherland. As soon as a rumor arose that the Jews would erect a synagogue for the exercise of their worship, the Dutch minister, Megapolensis, was immediately alive to the dangers of such a toleration of the Jews, "who have no other God than the unrighteous Mammon and no other aim than to get possession of Christian property, and to ruin all other merchants by drawing all trade to themselves." He earnestly requested the Classis of Amsterdam to use its influence with the directors of the Company to have "these godless rascals, who are of no benefit to the country, but look at everything for their own profit," removed from the Province.[87] Nevertheless the Jews remained, though Stuyvesant and his Council did all in their power to oust them. Here again the need of Jewish capital saved the Jews, and the directors at Amsterdam granted some relief from various disabilities under which Stuyvesant put the Jews. Thus the Director General failed to win over the directors to his

[84] *Col. Docs., N. Y.*, Vol. xiv, p. 451.
[85] *Col. Docs., N. Y.*, Vol. xiv, p. 461.
[86] *Eccl. Recs., N. Y.*, Vol. i, p. 486.
[87] *Eccl. Recs., N Y.*, Vol. i. p 335.

anti-Semitic policy by pointing out the dangers connected with further commercial concessions to the Jews. "To give liberty to the Jews will be very detrimental there, because the Christians there will not be able at the same time to do business. Giving them liberty, we cannot refuse the Lutherans and Papists."[88] Here Stuyvesant confounded religion and trade, and the directors insisted that the privileges granted by the company to the Jews in New Netherland were restricted to civil and political rights without giving them a right to claim the privilege of exercising their religion in a synagogue or at a gathering.[89] The directors were therefore greatly displeased on learning that Stuyvesant had refused the Jews permission to trade at Fort Orange and on the South River and also to purchase real estate which had been granted this Nation in the Netherlands. To show that his anxiety had not been premature, Stuyvesant informed the directors that the Jews had many times requested "the free and public exercise of their abominable religion . . . What they may obtain from your Honors, time will tell."[90] However, the Jews never obtained more than was granted to other forms of dissent outside of conquered New Sweden and Amsterdam's colony of New Amstel. They were allowed in all tranquillity their religion in their houses, which were, therefore, to be built "close together in a convenient place on one or the other side of New Amsterdam —at their own choice, as they have done here."[91] Some respect was also shown to their manner of life. In June 1658, two cases against Jacob Barsimson were called before the municipal court of New Amsterdam. "Though the defendant is absent, yet no default is entered against him, as he was summoned on his Sabbath."[92] When the instructions for sworn butchers were framed, a special oath was presented to the Jews, Asser Levy and Moses Lucena, that exempted them from killing hogs, which their religion did not allow.[93]

No special law was necessary to frustrate all efforts at the organization of Lutheran or Jewish worship besides the placard

[88] OPPENHEIM, *Early Hist. of Jews in New York*, p. 30.
[89] *Col. Docs., N. Y.*, Vol. xiv, p. 341.
[90] OPPENHEIM, *op. cit.*, p. 21.
[91] *Col. Docs., N. Y.*, Vol. xiv, p. 351.
[92] *Records of New Amsterdam*, Vol. ii, p. 396.
[93] *Ibid.*, Vol. vii, pp. 259, 261.

against conventicles, but this ordinance was not thought sufficiently severe to repress the Quakers who found no favor in the eyes of either the New Amsterdam clergy or government. The ministers saw in the Quakers the instruments of Satan to disturb the churches in America as well as in Europe, "wandering to and fro sowing their tares" among the people of the Province, but they trusted that God would baffle the designs of Satan;[94] the Director General and Council regarded them as anarchists, whose doings tended not only to the subversion of the Protestant religion, but also to the abolition of law and order, and to the contempt of civil authority.[95] For the repression of these "seducers of the people, who are destructive unto magistracy and ministry," an ordinance was at length issued, which made vessels bringing Quakers into the Province subject to confiscation and persons entertaining a Quaker a single night, liable to a fine of fifty pounds, of which one-half was to go to the informer.[96]

The proclamation of this ordinance met with open resistance from the people of Flushing, who were unwilling to infringe and violate the patent of the town, granted in the name of the States-General, guaranteeing "Liberty of Conscience according to the custom and manner of Holland, without molestacon or disturbance, from any magistrate or magistrates that may extend jurisdiccon over them."[97] Stuyvesant immediately instituted vigorous proceedings against the remonstrants, who were all brought to retract the principles which they had advanced in contradiction to the government's policy. Although they had espoused the cause of religious liberty, they had not the heroic fortitude that made the Quakers seal their testimony with their blood.[98] During these proceedings, twelve of the principal inhabitants of Jamaica informed the Director General and Council that the Quakers had unusual correspondence at the house of Henry Townsend, where they and their followers had also been "lodged and provided with meat and drink."[99] About the same time the Schout of Gravesend charged the former town clerk, John Tilton, with the crime

[94] *Eccl. Recs., N. Y.*, Vol. i, p. 400.
[95] *Records of New Amsterdam*, Vol. ii, p. 346.
[96] BRODHEAD, *History of State of New York*, Vol. i, p. 637.
[97] *Col. Docs., N. Y.*, Vol. xiv, pp. 402–04.
[98] Cf. ZWIERLEIN, *Religion in New Netherland*, pp. 219–223.
[99] *Col. Docs. N. Y.*, Vol. xiv, p. 405.

of having lodged a Quakeress with some others of that abominable sect,[100] but nowhere did Stuyvesant find so much support in the repression of this sect as in Hempstead. The magistrates of the town had learned "by woeful experience that of late a sect hath taken such ill effect amongst us to the seducing of certain of the inhabitants, who by giving heed to the seducing spirits under the notion of being inspired by the Holy Spirit of God, have drawn away with their error and misguided light those which together with us did worship God in spirit and truth, and more unto our grief to separate from us: and unto the great dishonor of God, and in violation of the established laws and the Christian order, that ought to be observed with love, peace, and concord, have broke the Sabbath, and neglected to join with us in the true worship and service of God, as formerly they have done." The inhabitants of the town and to the uttermost bounds thereof were therefore ordered to give no entertainment, nor to have any converse with the Quakers, who at the very most "are permitted for one night's lodging in the parish, and so to depart quietly without dispute or debate the next morning."[101] The opposition thus early manifested by the magistrates to the Quakers was the policy pursued without alteration in Hempstead. When Thomas Terry and Samuel Dearing petitioned for leave to settle some families at Matinecock within the jurisdiction of Hempstead, the magistrates of the town drew up a contract, dated July 4, 1661, which bound the petitioners to observe the laws of Hempstead, to admit only inhabitants possessing letters of commendation and approbation from the magistrates, elders or selected townsmen of their former place of residence, and finally "to bring in no Quakers or any such like opinionists, but such as are approved by the inhabitants of Hempstead." This contract was confirmed and still more specified as late as June 23, 1663.[102]

In spite of persecution, the Quaker movement gained strength on Long Island. When some inhabitants of Jamaica asked for a minister from New Amsterdam to preach and baptize, Stuyvesant instructed the minister Drisius, the deputy sheriff Resolved

[100] *Ibid.*, p. 406.

[101] THOMPSON, *History of Long Island*, Vol. ii, p. 11.

[102] *Records of North and South Hempstead*, Vol. i, pp. 143–45; *Col. Docs., N. Y.* Vol. xiv, p. 528.

Waldron, and the clerk Nicholas Bayard to go to Jamaica and obtain minute information on the violation of the ordinance against private conventicles by the Quakers and other sects.[103] Stuyvesant then found it necessary to purify the authorities in the town of unfaithful elements who "connive with the Sect, giving entertainment unto their scattering preachers, leave and way unto their unlawful meetings and prohibited conventicles."[104] The three new magistrates, Richard Everett, Nathaniel Denton, and Andrew Messenger, whose zeal for the good of the country and the Protestant cause would ensure the observance of the ordinance against conventicles, were ordered to call the inhabitants of the town together to sign a written statement, by which they bound themselves to inform the authorities about any meetings and conventicles of Quakers within the town and also to assist them against the Quakers in the case of need.[105] Only six refused to subscribe, upon whom finally soldiers were quartered with the promise of relief from this burden as soon as they would sign the pledge.[106] However the Jamaica authorities could do little to stamp out the Quakers as long as they assembled outside of their jurisdiction at the house of John Bowne in Flushing, who was accordingly arrested, tried, and sentenced. When the Quaker refused to submit to the judgment of the court, he was finally transported to Holland.[107] Stuyvesant sent a report of the case to the directors at Amsterdam, in which he complained of John Bowne as a disturber of the peace, who "obstinately persisted in his refusal to pay the fine imposed by the Court of the Province of New Netherland, and who now was banished" in the hope that other dissenters might be discouraged. The Director General also declared that he was determined to adopt "more severe prosecutions," if this example should fail to deter these sectarians from further contempt of authority in Church and State.[108]

When the directors at Amsterdam received Stuyvesant's letter, they felt that it was time again to restrain the religious zeal

[103] *Col. Docs., N. Y.*, Vol. xiv, p. 489.
[104] *Ibid.*, Vol. xii, p. 490.
[105] *Ibid.*, p. 492; *Jamaica Record*, Vol. i, p. 120.
[106] *Ibid.*, Vol. xiv, p. 493; *Amer. Hist. Rec.*, Vol. i, p. 210.
[107] Cf. ZWIERLEIN, *Religion in New Netherland*, pp. 234–241.
[108] O'CALLAGHAN, *History of New Netherland*, Vol. ii, p. 456.

of the Director General within the limits which they thought would not injure the interests of their colony. While they were also heartily desirous of seeing the Province free from Quakers and other sectarians, their zeal for the religious unity of the Province was tempered by the fear that a too rigorous policy might diminish the population and stop immigration, which had to be favored at this early stage of the development of the colony. Stuyvesant was, therefore, told by the directors, April 16, 1663, that he might shut his eyes to the presence of dissent in New Netherland, or at least that he was not to force the conscience, but to allow every one to have his own belief as long as he behaved quietly and legally, gave no offence to his neighbors, and did not oppose the government. The directors referred Stuyvesant to the moderation practiced toward all forms of dissent in the City of Amsterdam, which made it the asylum of the persecuted and oppressed from every country, with the result of a large increase of its population. The same blessing would follow an imitation of this policy of moderation in the colony of New Netherland.[109] The letter of the directors has generally been interpreted in the light of an edict of toleration extended to the Province of New Netherland, with which all persecution of the Quakers ceased until the termination of the Dutch rule.[110] A normal trip across the Atlantic in those days took about six weeks, so that the acts of repression, executed by the Council of New Netherland during the month of May, probably preceded the arrival of this letter in New Amsterdam. Thus on May 7th, the Fiscal was ordered to make an inventory of the property of John Tilton of Gravesend, who was then in prison.[111] Ten days later, a warrant was granted to remove the prisoner and his wife, Mary Tilton, from the province.[112] On the same day, a new ordinance was issued by the provincial government which inflicted heavy penalties upon skippers and barques, smuggling into the country any of those "abominable imposters, runaways, and strolling people called Quakers."[113] There is no doubt, however, that the Dutch

[109] *Col. Docs., N. Y.*, Vol. xiv, p. 526.

[110] BRODHEAD, *History of New York*, Vol i, p. 707; O'CALLAGHAN, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 457.

[111] O'CALLAGHAN, *Cal. Hist. Mss.* (Dutch), Vol. i, p. 246.

[112] *Ibid.*, p. 247.

[113] THOMPSON, *History of Long Island*, Vol. ii, p. 295.

minister Polhemius of Midwout, who in all his correspondence keeps himself free from the persecuting spirit of his fellow ministers in New Amsterdam, referred to some common measure of repression adopted against Quakers, when he wrote to the Classis of Amsterdam only four months before Stuyvesant's capitulation to the English: "They will have the Quakers . . . before Court under oath, which the Lord taught not."[114] In fact, the letter of the directors only requests Stuyvesant to connive at dissent within his jurisdiction, but at the same time entertain the thought that such connivance might not be possible, and in this event it merely reiterates the command given repeatedly in previous letters of the directors on similar occasions, at least to admit freedom of conscience, to allow every inhabitant of the Province to have his own belief. A more liberal interpretation of the letter also makes the conduct of the directors toward John Bowne unintelligible.[115] When Bowne petitioned the Directors of the

[114] *Eccl. Recs., N. Y.*, Vol. i, p. 544; cf. correction of text in A. EEKHOF, *De Hervormde Kerk in N. Amerika*, Vol. ii, p. 86*. Though "Religion in New Netherland" appeared in 1910, Dr. Eekhof still writes in 1913, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 26, that "the history of the Reformed Church in North America is not yet written with the use of the latest discovered sources and based on the original documents." As he acknowledged my work to be "fluently written and well documented" and as he cites no other records than I do, except in one particular, Dr. Eekhof means, by *original*, untranslated documents. It is true that a careful study of his work discloses about twenty corrections of documentary material translated into English, of which seven rectify mistakes in dating letters made by Dr. Corwin in the *Ecclesiastical Records of New York*, and the remainder correct mistranslated words or phrases, but in neither case are the corrections of any importance as usually it is a question of only a trifling matter. So far as I have seen, his work has no corrections to offer of any translations in the *Colonial Documents of New York*, and but of one word in Fernow's *Records of New Amsterdam*. Though differently arranged, Dr. Eekhof's narrative of the growth of the Dutch Reformed Church in New Netherland and of the repression of organized dissent is a close parallel to my own exposition of these matters. This is the case, not because he is dependent on my work, except here and there and that duly acknowledged in his footnotes, but because he makes as honest a use of the data drawn from the source material as I have done. Yet Dr. Eekhof takes occasion to remark anent "Religion in NewNetherland" that "*the cult and church persuasion of the author peeps around the corner at every turn.*" (*Op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 26.) The only new contribution by Dr. Eekhof is found in the documentary sources dealing with the relations of the Amsterdam Consistory with the West India Company in his book, *Bastiaen Jansz Crol*, which were not available in print before and make some corrections necessary in "Religion in New Netherland." This data has been utilized in this article. On the other hand Dr. Eekhof fails to take due account of the English immigration as a religious factor in New Netherland history; his point of view is too restricted, *i. e.*, national and provincial without sufficient regard to the outside world.

[115] Journal of JOHN BOWNE, *Amer. Hist. Record*, Vol. i, pp. 4–8.

West India Company for a pass to permit him to return to New Netherland, he was asked whether he intended to return to the colony to bring his wife and children to Holland. When he stated that his intention was to labor and maintain them there as he had done before, he was told that the directors thought it best for him to stay in Holland and to send for his wife and children, as *the Company does not give liberty there.* Bowne then appealed to the liberty guaranteed by the Flushing charter, but Director Perkins claimed that this patent was granted when nothing or little was heard in the colony of people of his persuasion. Bowne urged that the Quakers were a peaceable people, but he was told that their opposition to the laws of the Province proved the contrary to be the case. Although Bowne retorted that these laws were contrary to justice and righteousness and a violation of the privileges of their patent, the directors insisted that all those, who were unwilling to become subject to the ordinances of the colony, would not be permitted to live there. Nevertheless they drew up the conditions under which they would allow him to return to New Netherland. When Bowne received this paper to sign, he found the terms to be contrary to his conscience, faith, and religion.[116] He immediately wrote a letter to the West India Company in reply. He had expected justice from the directors, but only beheld additional oppression. As late as June 9th, he complained in his letter to his wife that the Company detained his goods and denied him a passage home except on conditions so gross and unreasonable that he chose to suffer the want of the dear company of his wife, the ruin of his estate in his absence there, and the loss of his goods here rather than yield or consent to such injustice.[117] At length Bowne did become quite free of the directors and he tells us in his journal that he again arrived at New Amsterdam early in the year 1664. He immediately proceeded to his home in Flushing, which was the first house he entered in the country. It is said that John Bowne again met the old Governor after the establishment of the English rule, as a private citizen, who then seemed ashamed of what he had done and glad to see the Quaker safe home again.[118]

[116] THOMPSON, *History of Long Island*, Vol. ii, p. 387.

[117] *Ibid.*, Vol. ii, p. 386.

[118] BESSE, *Sufferings of the Quakers*, Vol. ii, p. 237. Besse's account of the Bowne case is inaccurate.

Demonstration has, therefore, established that the policy of religious repression pursued in the Province of New Netherland on the outbreak of organized dissent was not merely local or temporary in character or personal to Stuyvesant. The colonial clergy, the natural custodians of the colony's orthodoxy, merited for their zeal in this regard the commendation of their ecclesiastical superiors in Holland, the Classis of Amsterdam, which insisted quite as vigorously with the directors of the West India Company in the Amsterdam Chamber on the repression of dissenting worship in private or public conventicles as the colonial clergy did with the civil authorities in the Province of New Netherland. The Director General did not fail to adopt all measures he judged necessary to fulfill the oath which bound him to maintain the exclusive worship of the Reformed Religion, and the directors in Holland did not at any time repudiate the policy of excluding all other worship, but they tried to persuade Stuyvesant to admit some connivance in regard to dissent, if this were possible, as they feared injury to the material interests of the Company, unless the policy of religious repression was tempered by some moderation. To insure this, all repressive ordinances were finally ordered to be submitted to the directors before their promulgation in the Province, but this meant no essential change of religious policy.

FREDERICK J. ZWIERLEIN, D.Sc.M.H. (*Louvain*).
St. Bernard's Seminary,
Rochester, N. Y.

MISCELLANY

A PARTIAL LIST OF THE CATHOLIC PRESS IN THE UNITED STATES

In his article on *Pioneer Efforts in Catholic Journalism in the United States*, the Rev. Dr. Foik, of the University of Notre Dame, dealt with the formation period of Catholic Journalism between the years 1809 and 1840.[1] "The whole disposition of Catholic journalism," he writes, "during these decades seems to have been to promote the harmony of society by removing from the pathway of non-Catholics the groundless prejudices and prepossessions which had grown up into social barriers, due chiefly to the circulation of misrepresentations and calumnies by the enemies of the Catholic Church in Europe and America and to the supineness of the Catholic body at large in the face of these attacks." In view of the influence of the press of the country in the present world struggle, it is interesting and instructive to know just how large a field is covered by the Catholic periodicals. The only lists published so far are those by a well-known historical student, the Rev. Dr. Middleton, of Villanova College.[2] In 1892, the number of such publications amounted to 457. The following list, which does not claim to be complete, is divided according to dioceses.

Alton

Franciscan Herald, Teutopolis, Ill.
The Western Catholic, Quincy, Ill.

Altoona

Altoona Monthly, Altoona, Pa.

Baltimore

Agnetian Monthly, Baltimore, Md.
Baltimore Catholic Review, Baltimore, Md.
The Catholic University Bulletin, Washington, D. C.

[1] *Cf. Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. i., pp. 258–270.

[2] *Cf. A list of Catholic and semi-Catholic Periodicals published in the United States from the earliest years down to the close of the year* 1892, in the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, Vol. iv (1893), pp. 213–242; and *Catholic Periodicals published in the United States from* 1809 *to* 1892, by the same writer in the *Records*, Vol. xix (1908), pp. 18–42.

The Colored Harvest, Baltimore, Md.
The Catholic Educational Review, Washington, D. C.
Georgetown College Journal, Washington, D. C.
The Catholic Historical Review, Washington, D. C.
The Indian Sentinel, Washington, D. C.
The Missionary, Washington, D. C.
The National Hibernian, Washington, D. C.
The New Century, Washington, D. C.
Pilgrims of Palestine, Washington, D. C.

Belleville

The Messenger, Belleville, Ill.

Bismarck

Volksfreund, Richardton, N. Dak.

Brooklyn

Catholic Deaf Mute, Richmond Hill, L. I., New York.
Record of C. B. L., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Slovenian Ave Maria, Brooklyn, N. Y.
The Tablet, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Boston

Boston College Stylus, Boston, Mass.
The Orphan's Friend, Boston, Mass.
The Pilot, Boston, Mass.
Sacred Heart Review, Boston, Mass.
The Working Boy, Boston, Mass.
The Hibernian, Boston, Mass.

Buffalo

C. M. B. A. Advocate, Buffalo, N. Y.
Aurora and Christliche, Buffalo, N. Y.
The Echo, Buffalo, N. Y.
Le Couteulx Leader, Buffalo, N. Y.
Catholic Union and Times, Buffalo, N. Y.
Volksfreund, Buffalo, N. Y.

Charleston

St. Anthony's Child Messenger, Florence, S. C.

Chicago

Amerikanisches Familien Blatt, Techny, Ill.
The Chicago Citizen, Chicago, Ill.
The Child Apostle, Chicago, Ill.
The Christian Family, Techny, Ill.
Dzien Swiety, Chicago, Ill.
Extension Magazine, Chicago, Ill.
Gazeta Katolicka, Chicago, Ill.
Journal of Our Lady of Victory's Mission, Chicago, Ill.
Katolicke Slovenske Noviny, Chicago, Ill.
Katholischer Jugenfreund, Evanston, Ill.
Le Courrier de l'Ouest, Chicago, Ill.
Pritel Ditek, Chicago, Ill.
Stadt Gottes, Techny, Ill.
The New World, Chicago, Ill.

Cincinnati

C. K. of A. Journal, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Home and Country, Cincinnati, Ohio.
St. Anthony's Messenger, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Sendbote des Gottlichen Herzens Jesu, Cincinnati, Ohio.
The Sodalist, Cincinnati, Ohio.
The Catholic Telegraph, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Young Catholic Messenger, Dayton, Ohio.

Cleveland

Catholic Bulletin, 5500 Lorain Ave., Cleveland, Ohio.
Magyarok Vasdrnapja, Cleveland, Ohio.
Palonia, Cleveland, Ohio.
Stimme der Wahrheit, Cleveland, Ohio.
The Catholic Universe, Cleveland, Ohio.
Youngstownske Slorenske Noviny, Youngstown, Ohio.

Columbus

The Catholic Columbian, Columbus, Ohio.
The Catholic Educational Association Bulletin, Columbus, Ohio.
The Josephinum Weekly, Columbus, Ohio.
Ohio Waisenfreund, Columbus, Ohio.
The Rosary Magazine, Somerset, Ohio.
The Youths Magazine, Somerset, Ohio.

Davenport

Iowa Catholic Messenger, Davenport, Iowa.

Denver

Denver Catholic Register, Denver, Colo.

Des Moines

The Western World, Des Moines, Iowa.

Detroit

The Angelus, Detroit, Mich.
The Guardian, Pontiac, Mich.
Kalamazoo Augustinian, Kalamazoo, Mich.
The Michigan Catholic, Detroit, Mich.
Stimme der Wahrheit, Detroit, Mich.

Dubuque

Katholischer Westen, Dubuque, Iowa.
Luzemburger Gazette, Dubuque, Iowa.
The Catholic Tribune, Dubuque, Iowa.

Erie

The Christian Home and School, Erie, Pa.

Fort Wayne

Annals of Our Lady of Lourdes, Notre Dame, Ind.
The Ave Maria, Notre Dame, Ind.
The Messenger, Huntington, Ind.
The Midland Naturalist, Notre Dame, Ind.
Scholastic, Notre Dame, Ind.
University Bulletin, Notre Dame, Ind.
The Sunday Visitor, Huntingdon, Ind.

Galveston

The Colored Man's Friend, Galveston, Texas.

Grand Rapids

The Light of Truth, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Green Bay

Illustrierte Monatscheft, St. Nariana, Wis.
Annals of St. Joseph, De Pere, Wis.
Volkestem, De Pere, Wis.

Hartford

Catholic Transcript, Hartford, Conn.
Bulletin of Missionaries of La Salette, Hartford, Conn.

Indianapolis

The Indiana Catholic, Indianapolis, Ind.
Paradesefruchts, St. Meinrad, Ind.

Kansas City

Catholic Register, Kansas City, Mo.

La Crosse

Patriot, La Crosse, Wis.
Vlastenec, La Crosse, Wis.

Leavenworth

The Catholic Register, Kansas City, Kan.

Little Rock

Amerikanski Slovenec, Joliet, Ill.
Echoes from the Pines, Little Rock, Ark.
The Southern Guardian, Little Rock, Ark.

Los Angeles and Monterey

The Tidings, Los Angeles, Cal.

Louisville

The Argus, Louisville, Ky.
Katholischer Glaubensbote, Louisville, Ky.
The Kentucky Irish American, Louisville, Ky.
The Record, Louisville, Ky.

Manchester

The Magnificat, Manchester, N. H.

Milwaukee

Caecilia, St. Francis, Wis.
The Catholic Citizen, Milwaukee, Wis.
Columbia, Milwaukee, Wis.
Excelsior, Milwaukee, Wis.
Marquette University Journal, Milwaukee, Wis.
Nowiny Polskie, Milwaukee, Wis.
Our Young People, Milwaukee, Wis.
The Salesianum, St. Francis, Wis.
The Catholic School Journal, Milwaukee, Wis.
Tygodnik Polski, Milwaukee, Wis.

Minneapolis

Echo de l'Ouest, Minneapolis, Minn.
Irish Standard, Minneapolis, Minn.

Mobile

The Catholic Monthly, Birmingham, Ala.

Nashville

The Catholic Journal, Memphis, Tenn.

Newark

The Monitor, Newark, N. J.
Orphans Messenger and Advocate, Jersey City, N. J.
Sacred Heart Union, Arlington, N. J.

New Orleans

The Morning Star, New Orleans, La.

New York

America, New York City, N. Y.
Benziger's Magazine, New York City, N. Y.
Chaplains' Aid Association Bulletin, 605 5th Ave., New York, N. Y.
Die Christliche Mutter, New York City, N. Y.
The Catholic Convert, New York City, N. Y.
Emmanuel, New York City, N. Y.
The Field Afar, Ossining, N. Y.
Fordham Monthly, New York City, N. Y.
Freeman's Journal, New York City, N. Y.
The Helper, New York City, N. Y.
The Holy Name Journal, New York City, N. Y.
The Homiletic Monthly, New York City, N. Y.
Irish World, New York City, N. Y.
The Lamp, Garrison, N. Y.
The Leader, New York City, N. Y.
L'Italiano in America, New York City, N. Y.
The Messenger of the Sacred Heart, New York City, N. Y.
The Catholic Mind, New York City, N. Y.
The Missionary, New York City, N. Y.
Catholic Missions, New York City, N. Y.
The Catholic News, New York City, N. Y.
The Official Catholic Directory, New York City, N. Y.
The Pilgrim of Our Lady of Martyrs, New York City, N. Y.
Annals of the Propagation of the Faith, New York City, N. Y.
The Register, New York City, N. Y.
St. Vincent de Paul Quarterly, New York City, N. Y.
Sentinel of the Blessed Sacrament, New York City, N. Y.
The Sunday Companion, New York City, N. Y.
The Catholic Transcript, New York City, N. Y.
Truth, 405 Lexington Ave., New York City, N. Y.
The Catholic World, New York City, N. Y.

Ogdensburg

Forest Leaves, Gabriels, N. Y.

Omaha

The True Voice, Omaha, Nebr.

Oregon City

Der Armen Seelen Freund, Mt. Angel, Oregon.
Mt. Angel Magazine, Mt. Angel, Oregon.
St. Joseph's Blatt, Mt. Angel, Oregon.
Catholic Sentinel, Portland, Oregon.

Peoria

The Bee Hive, Pekin, Ill.

Philadelphia

Catholic Abstainer, Philadelphia, Pa.
Bethlehem, Philadelphia, Pa.
American Ecclesiastical Review, Philadelphia, Pa.
Our Lady of Good Counsel, Philadelphia, Pa.
Il Risveglio Italiano, Philadelphia, Pa.
Nord Amerika, Philadelphia, Pa.
The American Catholic Quarterly, Philadelphia, Pa.
Records of the American Catholic Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pa.
The Catholic Standard and Times, Philadelphia, Pa.
The Young Folks Catholic Weekly, Philadelphia, Pa.

Pittsburgh

Annalen der Kindheit Jesu, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Beobachter, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Annals of the Holy Childhood, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Pittsburgh Catholic, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Pittsburgh Observer, Pittsburgh, Pa.
St. Joseph's Journal, Pittsburgh, Pa.
St. Vincent's Journal, Beatty, Pa.
Seraphic Child of Mary, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Seraphischer Kinderfreund, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Wielkopalanin, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Portland

Le Petit Journal, Lewiston, Me.

Providence

Providence Visitor, Providence, R. I.

Rochester

C. R. and A. Bulletin, Auburn, N. Y.

St. Cloud

Der Botschafter, Collegeville, Ind.
Der Norstern, St. Cloüd, Minn.
St. John's University Record, Collegeville, Minn.

St. Joseph

Tabernakel and Fegfeuer, Clyde, Mo.
Tabernacle and Purgatory, Clyde, Mo.
Catholic Tribune, St. Joseph, Mo.

St. Louis

Amerika, St. Louis, Mo.
Bulletin of the Am. F. of Catholic Societies, St. Louis, Mo.
Central Blatt and Social Justice, St. Louis Mo.
Church Progress, St. Louis, Mo.
Father Dunne's Newsboy's Journal, St. Louis, Mo.
Fortnightly Review, 18 So. 6th St., St. Louis, Mo.
Herold des Glaubens, St. Louis, Mo.
Hlas, St. Louis, Mo.
Pastoralblatt, St. Louis, Mo.
The Queen's Work, St. Louis, Mo.
The Western Watchman, St. Louis, Mo.

St. Paul

The Catholic Bulletin, St. Paul, Minn.
Northwestern Chronicle, St. Paul, Minn.
Wanderer, St. Paul, Minn.

Sacramento

The Catholic Herald, Sacramento, Cal.

Salt Lake

Intermountain Catholic, Salt Lake City, Utah.

San Antonio

Katholische Rundschau, San Antonio, Texas.
Nory Domoy, Hallattsville, Texas.
The Southern Messenger, San Antonio, Texas.

San Francisco

L'Imparziale, San Francisco, Cal.
The Monitor, San Francisco, Cal.
The Leader, San Francisco, Cal.

Santa Fe

Revista Catholica, Las Vegas, N. Mex.

Scranton

The Catholic Light, Scranton, Pa.

Seattle

The Catholic Northwest Progress.

Springfield

L'Opinion Publique, Worcester, Mass.
Messenger, Worcester, Mass.
Springfield Tribune, Springfield, Mass.

Syracuse

Catholic Sun, Syracuse, N. Y.

Toledo

Kuryer Katolicki, Toledo, Ohio.
Catholic Layman, Toledo, Ohio.
Catholic Record, Toledo, Ohio.

Wheeling

Church Calendar, Wheeling, W. Va.

Wichita

The Catholic Advance, Wichita, Kans.

Wilmington

The Echo, Childs, Del.
Echoes of the Oblates of St. Francis, Childs, Md.
St. Anthony's Monthly, Clayton, Del.

Winona

The Winona Courier, Winona, Minn.

DOCUMENTS

AN ACCOUNT OF THE VOYAGE MADE BY THE FRIGATES "PRINCESA" AND "FAVORITA" IN THE YEAR 1799 FROM SAN BLAS TO NORTHERN ALASKA

(Translated from an Unpublished Manuscript in the Archives of the University of Santa Clara, California)[1]

An account of the voyage made by Father John Riobó, as chaplain of His Majesty's frigates la Princesa and la Favorita to discover new lands and seas north of the settlements of the ports of Monterey and of our Father, San Francisco; whose Missions are in charge of the Apostolic Missionaries of the College of San Fernando of Mexico.

Departure—Storm and Vow to the Blessed Virgin

In the Frigate called the *Princesa*, naval Lieutenant, Don Ignatius Orteaga of the Royal Armada, went as Commandant of the expedition, Lieutenant Don Fernando Quiros y Miranda of the Royal Armada being second in command.

The Captain of the other Frigate, the *Favorita*, was a Lieutenant of the same rank, Don Juan Francis de la Bodega y Cuadra. This last ship carried 107 men on the roll and supplies for fifteen months, and the *Princesa*, a crew of 98 men with food for nineteen months. Both of them had a supply of water for seven months.

On February 11, 1779, we left the Port of San Blas at about midnight sailing to windward and casting anchor near the coast with light land breezes. On the twenty-fifth we decided to depart southward from Marias Islands unable, as we were, to make headway towards the north. On the twenty-sixth we doubled the Islands and we still had winds from the Fourth Quadrant blowing from the northwest and we lost always in Latitude until March 5. The winds then began to vary from north to northwest. We had reached at that time 19 degrees 47 minutes north latitude and 8 degrees 21 minutes west of the meridian of San Blas.[2]

With winds blowing in the same direction we crossed the tropic on the seventeenth of the same month.

As soon as we left the torrid zone, the winds became very strong so that we were obliged to lie to several times, reefed sometimes with mainsail or foresail, sometimes with staysail. On April 4, the winds began to change towards the

[1] The original is in a sort of commonplace book, which was kept by the Franciscans at Santa Clara Mission and was found in the library there by the Jesuit Fathers when they took over the Mission about 1851. The translation is by the Very Rev. Walter Thornton, S.J., the present Rector of the University of Santa Clara. The book belonged to the old Santa Clara Mission, which was founded in 1777 and contains many private notes of the Superior on matters relating to the Indians. The book is about 2 inches thick; the pages are in splendid condition with no frayed edges; the edges are not cut sharply but are as in the old hand-made paper of the times. The pages are 8¾ inches in length by 6 inches in width. The Mss. of the *Voyage* is 8 folios long. The ink is a little faded, but clear. In the original there are twenty-four paragraphs, each paragraph being numbered, but in another hand from the original. The folio is written on both sides. The handwriting is good, and in marked contrast to the other letters of the collection. The present translation came to the *Review* through Mr. Michael Williams, of Carmel, California. Cf. GREENHOW, *History of Oregon and California and the other Territories on the Northwest Coast of North America*, 2nd Ed., p. 125. Boston, 1845; PALOU, *Noticias*, t. iv, c. 2, pp. 71-73.

[2] Note that the meridian is taken from San Blas. This will account for the longitude in the narrative.

second quadrant and during that night a northeast wind rushed in on us with great fury and the frigate was tossed about violently. Nothing remained in place, even the medicine chest, notwithstanding its great weight, was thrown about and the greater part of its syrups, essential oils, and medicines were lost.

We continued on without further incident until the nineteenth, and reached about the forty-first degree of latitude and the thirty-seventh of longitude when we were assailed by a fierce southeastern storm. The hurricane raged all night, and we ran with the foresail only as we feared to carry more sail. On the twentieth in this storm, we lost sight of the *Favorita*, till then our inseparable companion.

On the morning of the same day, I went with the Commandant to the quarter deck, and in the name of all the crew on the Frigate he made a vow to Our Lady of the Rosary, patroness of the frigate. He promised the foresail as an offering at her shrine and likewise that he would carry, barefooted, the mast in procession to the Church at San Blas, if the Blessed Virgin would obtain our delivery from this and other dangers which we might encounter and should we return safely to harbor. As if a reward of this promise, Our Lady favored us with her powerful protection. Indeed, it would be difficult to find another example of a voyage of discovery fraught with so many dangers and so happily ended.

Henceforth the winds continued as favorable as we could wish although the rain and cold were annoying. We directed our course for the harbor of Bucareli.[3] There we arrived on May 3, and met the *Favorita* which had entered at two o'clock in the morning, preceding us by only ten hours after fourteen days of separation. The wind did not allow us to cast anchor nearby, but we succeeded on the east coast in front of a small bay which we found later to be a fine port and to which we gave the name of Santa Cruz because we discovered it on Holy Cross day.

Here again we experienced the effects of Divine Providence which guided us. Compelled by the current and much more by strong gusts of wind we dropped anchor provisionally in the first propitious spot we met, intending to choose a better location later. There was not the least suspicion of danger. The next morning, however, at ebb tide we beheld an enormous rock directly in front of the ship. It was scarcely further from us than the length of the frigate. We would have been undoubtedly wrecked, had we advanced a little farther. On May 6, the two frigates went to a safe anchorage within the harbor of Santa Cruz. There were no other incidents worthy of note during the trip so far other than that the weather was persistently cold and there was much rain. We had also to regret the death of one soldier and a naval gunner.

Indians and Their Customs

From the first day we tried to get in touch with the Indians, searching for them among their rancherias. After having hidden their women in the woods, they came to us with signs and tokens of peace, some throwing white feathers in

[3] Bucareli is situated on the southern extremity of Prince of Wales Island.

the air from a promontory on the sea, and others, standing in a line on the shore with their arms extended in the form of a cross. We gave gifts to each of them and they in turn gave us fish. The fish was of the ordinary kind, a very common species, yet as we were in great need of fresh food, we appreciated it highly. From that day they continued to come to our vessels at all hours, but especially at sunrise and sunset, bringing with them various articles for trading—fish, sleeping mats made of the bark of a certain tree, skins of seal, otter, deer, bear and other animals. They showed us their weapons and even traded us some of them. Their arrows are very finely made; some of them are pointed with flint, some with bone, but most of them have heads of copper and iron and they are very sharp. These Indians have a kind of armor something like that of the ancients with buckler and spear; they have even protection for their thighs and legs, very skilfully made from pieces of hard wood joined and fastened together with a kind of very strong cord. On their heads they carry the figure of a ferocious beast rather skilfully and artfully carved from wood. They are extremely fond of iron of which they possess many lances and knives. Their lances are very well made and are very straight and regular in form; some having a spear head twenty-four inches in length with a very long and well made staff. The knives are short with double cutting edges like a carpenter's plane. They are very desirous of obtaining copper and iron but they are chiefly anxious for iron, so much so that as soon as they see a piece of barrel hoop they care no longer for glass beads, mirrors, rings or anything else that is presented to them. Among these Indians three shades of color are found; some in complexion and features are very light Europeans; others have more the appearance of Indians especially in hair features and color; others again are just Indians like the rest found in America.

I sang a Mass of thanksgiving ashore on Ascension Day and some of the Indians attended it. On this occasion I preached a short sermon. In memory of the Feast the great guns of the frigates were fired, but the Indians showed no fear. Yet, when they first heard the report of the guns on our arrival they betook themselves to precipitate flight.

Exploration of the Land

After paying this homage to the Blessed Virgin, two boats armed and provided with food for eighteen days, were sent out to survey the bay, which penetrates far inland between mountains covered with fir trees and snow on the northern side. Don Francis Mourelle, the sailing master, who had the rank of Ensign on the Frigate, and his first mate Don Joseph Camacho, belonging to the Armada, together with the second officer of the *Favorita*, Don Juan Bautista de Aguirre and Don Juan Pantajo y Arriaga, took part in the expeditions.

After spending twenty-six days on their reconnoiter—an interval which we made good use of by taking in water, ballast and wood—they returned on June 12. Their return was a great relief to us as we feared that some mishap had befallen them. Indeed, everything was to be feared as a very great number of Indians, in more than one hundred canoes had come to establish themselves

in a cove of this harbor. They showed themselves so bold that they stole everything they could and went so far as to throw down the cross erected on the occasion of the Thankgisving ceremonies, in order to obtain the nails.

The men brought back with them a map they made of the bay and the litteral. The work was done thoroughly and is of great importance.

We find that the place in which we now are is rather an arm of the sea than a bay. It contains ten harbors, each one very safe and sheltered. There is plenty of water, ballast and wood on the shore, a great many bays, numberless islands, and further on several arms of the sea which penetrate deeply into the land. These run to the north, east, northeast and northwest further than they were able to observe. The Indians robbed them of many necessary articles whenever they had an opportunity. They frequently attacked them, defied them to fight and kept them ever on the watch day and night. The men did not wish to harm them, but as the Indians became more bold every moment, scorned their arms and bragged repeatedly of their own power, they were compelled to act. They trained their guns on two of the canoes that were empty and demolished them without injuring the Indians. Finally they caught one of them who was more audacious than the rest and after whipping him with rods for a few moments, let him go. They were not troubled after this.

Desertion of Two Seamen and Trouble with the Indians

On June 13 the crew went to wash their clothes on the shore opposite to that which was occupied by the Indians, and with whom, after the unfortunate experience of the boats, we began again to treat freely.

On leaving, two sailors of the *Favorita* were missing. Our men turned back to look for them, but as they did not appear, an Indian of some authority among them was held as a prisoner. Once on board he was made to understand that if he was kept a prisoner, it was merely because two of our men were missing and that he should tell his people to bring them back. He shouted and a canoe arrived and after having spoken with the Indians on it, he told us that the seamen were in the Indian settlement and that at sunrise they would bring them back. They failed to so do, however; they brought only one in a canoe and stopped far from the frigate. The man was well hidden and as soon as they uncovered him we told him to come aboard. He answered that they would not allow him and we could see that the Indians took away an oar which he had seized in order to row to us. They brought him back to their hamlet shouting fiercely. At this the Indian on board was much vexed that they did not keep their promise. We were much troubled at this incident and we thought it a sufficient reason for breaking off with the Indians and recovering by force the two seamen. We pitied the poor Indians, however, and resolved to try other means. We determined therefore to capture some more of them in order that a greater number might make an exchange possible. For this purpose we managed to have an old Indian come to our frigate, but he was a little suspicious and went back saying that he would wait in his own canoe until it was boarded by our pilot's mate. This latter was advised to do so, but to make good his escape and enter our boat at the first opportunity. The Indians,

however, were very sharp and noticing that their old man was not coming back and that the pilot's mate was very eager to leave them and get into our boat, they seized him by force and tried to head their canoes for the shore. In order to scare them three or four musket shots were fired and at the same instant the *Favorita* began to shoot. Being afraid, the natives started to row very rapidly, but their canoes collided and some of them capsized. Immediately our boats went to the help of the drowning Indians. None were lost. In all we picked up about a score of them. We brought them aboard and gave them plenty to eat. They surely ate splendidly. After giving them presents of cloth to cover themselves, we made them understand that all this had been done merely because we wanted back our two men. We assured them that we wished to be their friends, but that we must have our two men back. They took leave of us with the best signs of friendship, our boats taking them to the Indian settlement to make the exchange. It was effected in the following manner. They gave one of our seamen for the old Indian who spent the night on board the *Favorita* and the other missing man for all the crowd of captives. They were a little reluctant to do this because the last sailor was held in a different settlement. We were very glad to receive our men again, but they confessed that they had deserted of their own accord, and that the Indians were not to blame. The Captain ordered them punished as well for their desertion as for the amount of trouble given to the expedition. They were tied to a gun and given twenty lashes.

We found afterwards and it grieved us very much that an Indian had been killed by a gunshot. The Captain felt, however, that it was very necessary that the Indians should understand that an attack on us in great numbers would be met with determination. He tried his best, however, not to injure them in any way.

Bucareli—The Native Women

On the evening of that day the Indians left and we sailed on the fifteenth to pursue our course, but contrary winds obliged us to enter the harbor of San Antonio which lies on the opposite side of Santa Cruz. Although we tried to do so twice, we were not able to depart until July 10. We took leave, not without much regret, of the Indians who had come to settle there in order to be near us.

During the fifty-eight days we spent in Bucareli, only ten or twelve were clear. During the rest of the time the weather was bad—winds, fogs and rains as in the severest winter, the greater part of the country is rocky and the arable land, which is scarce, is covered with very tall fir trees even down to the very shore. We found there also a variety of flowering plants and among them a certain herb or seed very like to the common rye, both as to the leaves and the product.

So great is the eagerness of the Indians for iron that even the women carried a little knife hanging to their neck with which they make and carve from wood, trays of different shapes, very beautifully worked. These women have fine features and some are exceedingly white but all make themselves hideous by a

little tablet, two fingers wide, which they carry on their under lip. There is a horizontal incision for that purpose and they insert the wooden tablet through the opening until it rests against the teeth. It is considered a distinctive mark of married women. The unmarried women have only an incision in the lip from which they hang a small stick or a copper needle. They have many ornaments made of this metal. The women are all very warlike and full of scars due according to their own report to stabs with knives.

We have the pleasure of bringing back with us three little boys who were abandoned by the Indians who told us that they did not want them. The youngest of these was brought aboard to my companion, Father Mathias, one evening while I was on land visiting the sick in the barracks. He was very sick and weak; with great care however, he was soon out of danger.

Northward to Alaska

On July 1, we succeeded in clearing the entrance of Bucareli which is situated in the 55 degrees and 18 minutes of north latitude and 32 degrees of longitude. On account of the winds we went southward, reaching the fifty-third degree. With a favorable wind we started north again and the same day land was sighted at 58 degrees and 30 minutes but the wind prevented us from exploring it. The weather continued at that time very dark and foggy until July 16, when with a favorable wind and clear sky we continued our journey north of the fifty-ninth degree. The shore is very precipitous and entirely covered with snow down to the sea. We distinguished some very high mountains which rose above the clouds, particularly one which can compete with the most famous peaks known anywhere.

On July 17, we were able to see Cape St. Elias situated in the 60th degree of latitude and the 43d degree of longitude, a position very different from the one it has on the Russian map. We saw also the island immediately opposite and to which the Commandant gave the name of Carmel because it was discovered on the day dedicated to Our Lady of Mt. Carmel.[4] Until the twenty-first we were crossing the large bay which forms a coast in that place. On the evening of July 20, having mounted to the quarter deck, as I was about to sit down on the so-called patience bench, I fainted and remained senseless for some time. The Commandant and the Surgeon hurried to my assistance and with the remedies they gave me I recovered entirely. Perhaps it was an effect of sleeplessness because for ten days I was not able to close my eyes.

On the twenty-first of the same month we arrived at a large harbor in the same direction as the passage we were seeking. We called it St. James the Apostle because at that time we were celebrating the novena of the Saint and also because as the patron of Spain he would be our help during this voyage. Here we took possession of this harbor in the name of the King. It is situated in 60 degrees 13 minutes north latitude and 45 degrees 30 minutes longitude.[5]

The island which lies in that harbor we called St. Mary Magdalene. Our first mate with the rank of Ensign of the Frigate and a companion sailed in a

[4] Probably Middleton Island.
[5] This was probably Prince William Sound.

boat to find if there was any passage in the northerly direction towards the west of the island in the direction of the coast. They came back announcing that the coast ran from the south as a prolongation from the Cape of St. Elias with very high lands covered with snow.

Eskimos

We decided on account of this report to follow the coast in order to see whether the passage could be found farther north. We treated with Indians who met us three miles out at sea in several canoes of a very particular construction. These canoes are made with curved forms covered with a strong skin, very well and tightly sown. They have only two holes like the mouth of an earthen jar and in each an Indian takes his place. When the two occupants are in their place the canoes are so tightly closed that it is impossible even in a rough sea for anything inside to get wet. At first sight in the distance we thought that there were many Indians approaching but as they came closer we saw that there were only six. They are much fairer of complexion than those at Bucareli and much more curious. They wear a kind of short jacket made of the skin of animals and stitched with a string like that of a guitar and very nicely made. They are ashamed to appear naked and never do so. Besides these six in these three canoes the men of our boat saw about two hundred persons coming in six common but large canoes. They were friendly to them but did not notice anything further. The women had their hair cut short and a string of big beads hanging down to their chest from the corners of their mouth where they were attached. The men carried a bone artistically carved and ornamented on the upper lip and like the other Indians they are very much inclined to steal and they are very cunning in doing it. Just imagine, one day while on board, they stole an iron hook belonging to the frigate of such great weight that it would seem incredible. The next day, however, the very Indian who had taken it returned to steal something else and he was caught. Though we had not missed the hook, when asked if he had taken anything else he confessed it publicly and on search we found that the hook was gone. He promised to return it but as we had to sail the same day we did not recover it. In this bay there are many fish of fine quality. The forests, however, are neither as great nor the trees as tall as at Bucareli. The trees, however, belong to the same species and there are extensive fields of green grass.

On July 28 we sailed and from the twenty-ninth we began to experience very threatening and cloudy weather and terrible rains and strong winds from the first quadrant. The winds soon became hurricanes and the days were made up of raging storms. There was the greatest fear of shipwreck surrounded as we were with islands and great rocks in the vicinity of the coast which from time to time we could glimpse through the breaks in the clouds. In such dangers we spent several days and nights without proceeding because we could not go ahead for fear of striking against the rocky coast.

On July 31, and August 1, we continued to windward in and out among numberless islands almost always with the same danger and identical weather, the storm not allowing us to escape either on one side or the other. In this ex-

tremity the Commandant resolved to cast anchor which we discovered at the portside of the ship. We succeeded in doing this safely with the two frigates at 9 o'clock on August 2—a day memorable for our religious order. We took possession for the second time in the name of the king in a bay not far from there and gave it the name of Our Lady de Regla.

On August 3, we drew a map of the place and we found that the coast was running from west to south. We took our position and found that we were at 59 degrees and 8 minutes north latitude and 49 degrees longitude. We did not discover any Indians nearby but in the distance we could see some. These Indians seemed well favored in comparison with those on the lands seen by us thus far. Although there is little wood and few forests on the shores yet they have plenty of water and a great deal of grass. Many flowers were in bloom and the landscape appeared beautiful beyond measure, arguing the fertility of the soil.

The Journey Back—San Francisco

On account of the advanced season the Commandant decided on a return voyage. Moreover we had not found the passage we were seeking. We were unable to proceed further north owing to the foggy weather conditions as we were continually running into one storm after another; besides we had already lost seven men by sickness and several were attacked by scurvy and were dangerously ill. Therefore, as soon as we had a favorable wind which came on August 8 we sailed for the Mendocino Cape which we sighted on September 4. Thus after meeting with contrary winds from the south or southeast until August 22, which forced us again higher than the 54th degree of latitude and the 33d degree of longitude we finally found a favorable wind which brought us to the Mendocino Cape. Having been becalmed for eight days without further incident, on September 15 we entered the harbor of our Father, San Francisco.

Here in the Presidio they provided barracks for the sick seamen of both frigates and likewise places for the pilots who had to finish their maps and sketches of the coast and the discovered lands. We presented a beautiful picture of the Virgin de los Remedios to the Mission Church, which the Captain of the *Favorita*, Don Juan Francisco de Cuadra y Bodega had vowed to Our Lady.

This presentation was made with great solemnity. We carried it in procession and deposited it in the Church of the Mission of Our Father St. Francis, accompanied by all the officers, captains and fathers of the mission.

A high Mass was sung with all solemnity. Salvos of artillery were fired and there was general rejoicing at the success of our expedition and the day ended with a musical concert in the Plaza. The pilots continued their work on the maps and sketches until September 30 and on this day we sailed for San Blas.

BOOK REVIEWS

Beginnings of the American People. By Carl Lotus Becker. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company (the Riverside Press), 1915. Pp. 279.

A preface sufficiently modest suggests the treatment by each author of that part of the story which the plan of the publishers required him to prepare. The first of the four attractive volumes which make up this new history of the United States contains the best account of the extension of geographical knowledge to be found in any college text book known to the reviewer. But admirable though it is in matter and in form a few topics have been omitted, the consideration of which would contribute to completeness of outline. The zeal of Irish missionaries, who visited and for a time dwelt in Iceland as well as the enterprise of Norsemen, who came to America, if not suitable themes for discussion, should at least have been noticed. While these achievements, so far as is now known, had nothing to do with the Columbian discovery of America, it is well to inform the student that though the nations on the Mediterranean were the leaders in trade and navigation, yet there was enterprise in regions more remote and not a little geographical information in countries generally believed to have been backward.

In any account of the discovery of America it is important to remember that on January 6, 1492, when Granada surrendered, Columbus, as we learn from his *Journal*, was an interested spectator of that great event. If, in obedience to the command of Isabella, he had made the long journey to Santa Fé, it is certain that Her Majesty had resolved to equip the expedition of discovery *before* the surrender. It is well known that the mule which Columbus rode and the raiment that he wore on that occasion were the gifts of the Queen.

Having, under the terms of the agreement, furnished one-eighth of the cost of the expedition, the share of Columbus in any profits was to have been, not a *tithe*, as stated in this volume, but an eighth. Though this is a minor point, it counts for accuracy. Furthermore, the details of the equipment of this memorable expedition are not generally understood by even professional students of American history. Wherever it is practicable,

the conclusions of history should be as reliable as those of sciences more exact.

It is evident that the author is reading into the history of the pre-Columbian period ideas that are comparatively modern. In this part of his narrative the emphasis is placed on the profits of commerce as the major force influencing not only the first voyage of Columbus, but the earlier activity of Prince Henry and others interested in exploration. In his *Journal*, Columbus records the following sentiment: "Your Highnesses, as Catholic Christians and Princes, loving the Holy Christian faith and the spreading of it, and enemies of the sect of Mohamet and of all idolatries and heresies, decided to send me, Christopher Columbus, to the said regions of India, to see the said Princes and the people and lands, and to learn of their disposition, and of everything, and the measures which could be taken for their conversion to our Holy Faith; and you ordered that I should not go to the east by land, by which it is customary to go, but by way of the west, whence until today we do not know certainly that any one has gone. . . ." From the pages of Major and others we know that Prince Henry's interest was sustained by similar non-economic motives.

Professor Becker well says that in exchange for their gold and silver, "Spain imposed upon the natives of America an enlightened despotism and the benefits of a Christian civilization." He should have added that the good intentions of the Spanish monarchs were of little value to the Indian, for the greedy merchant class lay in wait to exploit him.

From the author's sketch of the rise of Puritanism the student can hardly fail to conclude that outside its membership there was in England little virtue or little genuine culture. As a matter of fact, the virtue of that era was engrossed by no church, while its culture was chiefly found in the Established Church and in what was left of the older church. In the realms of literature, indeed, one thinks of Milton, one of the most versatile as well as one of the greatest English men of letters, of the satirist Marvel, who had a turn for politics and pastorals, and of the inspired tinker Bunyan. To some readers these men of genius appear to have been separated by a wide interval from Sidney, Lyly, Spenser, Southwell, Jonson, Daniel, Lodge, Shakespeare, Crashawe, Her-

bert, Habington, Hobbes, Hooker and others. If it is true that the Puritans lived in a spiritual world, it is not less certain that there yet survived in its purer atmosphere rum to be consumed, and in America Indians to be defrauded, Catholics to be vilified, and Quakers to be hanged. All the effects of its fanaticism have not yet passed into nothingness. This section also includes an interesting narrative showing the decline of Puritanism as well as an enumeration of the forces which contributed to its disintegration. If one cannot perfectly agree with every statement of the author, one must acknowledge that he has a good grasp of events of that epoch and a clear insight into the elemental forces of its society. Remote as were the different settlements, it is evident from his narrative that the isolated communities of the wilderness were beginning to get into rather close contact with the intellectual life of the mother country.

The account of Pennsylvania, while making mention of the purchase of the three lower counties on the Delaware, fails to notice the somewhat significant fact that the same territory had long before been granted by Charles I to Lord Baltimore, a transaction which shows the less admirable side of Penn's character. The Duke of York, afterward King James II, it has never been the fashion of historians to praise.

While Parkman's writings are named in the bibliographical note appended to Chapter IV, one receives from the summary of Professor Becker a different impression of French achievement in the New World from that which one gains by a perusal of *The Jesuits in North America*. The word Jesuit appears to have become a common noun, primarily denoting a talent for intrigue. The phrase is "unscrupulous intrigue," though it is probable that no intrigue is every perfectly scrupulous. The author has read much, but he does not appear to have traveled far in the realms of that fine body of literature which treats of the Catholic missions and missionaries of America. To assert that Canada was little more than "a musket, a rosary, and a pack of beaver skins," an opinion that is quoted, is hardly good history and in literary merit is scarcely equal to "a bracelet of bright hair about the bone," a vivid verse of Donne. Whatever may be said of the methods of the French in dealing with the Indians, the natives were

not extirpated in those regions where men of that cultured nation were influential. It is only from those parts of the mainland of the New World colonized by the English that the aboriginal inhabitants have nearly disappeared.

One would expect to find in the section on settlement a brief sketch of the first two Lords Baltimore and at least a word concerning the province which they established. The history of Maryland being at once interesting and instructive, one is surprised to find the deeds of those enlightened gentlemen overlooked in any outline of our colonial history. It is true that the facts of Maryland history somewhat mar the fair picture of Puritanism elsewhere drawn by the author. His description of religious conditions in eighteenth century America, thoroughly Protestant in tone, is animated and brilliant. In fact the first as well as the three remaining volumes of this work is made up of well written essays. This plan has, it is true, the merit of making history entertaining, but, short of a *tour de force*, not every important topic can be put into the procrustean bed which is the characteristic of that literary form.

The causes of the American Revolution are adequately described or suggested. But the military history of the conflict, by design but an outline, does not even enumerate the forces that won the war. This subject, in itself exceedingly instructive, is but little known to the average American college graduate. The war, beginning in 1779, between Spain and Great Britain by giving employment to the troops of the empire, to a part of England's navy, and to some of her German auxiliaries was not without influence on the victory at Yorktown and the acquisition of the Mississippi Valley. The assistance received from the French of the Illinois country as well as from the Spaniards of the Gulf is not even alluded to. Nor is there any account of the relations of Holland to the struggle.

The date usually assigned for the voyage of Verrazzano is 1524 instead of 1534. "Hampden Court" is printed for Hampton Court. Doubtless these slips will disappear in a second edition. The author has adopted the traditional opinion concerning Captain John Smith, an estimate that is hardly critical.

Union and Democracy, by Allen Johnson, a volume slightly

larger than the preceding, and the second of this series, is, on the whole, little more than a thrice-told tale. Carefully, though not slavishly following in the footsteps of his predecessors, the author has given a reliable account of that part of American history between the treaty of Paris and the election of John Quincy Adams. The importance of the West, with its new democracy, is, indeed, properly given more prominence than is usual in college histories of the United States, while the final chapter, which deals with the rise of Federal sovereignty, contains in a few paragraphs an excellent summary of those opinions of Chief Justice Marshall which set the example of a "loose construction" of the Constitution, making it for the American people an abundant source of content, prosperity and greatness.

Expansion and Conflict, by William E. Dodd, the third volume of this series, is an interesting narrative describing the events of the two score years from 1825 to 1865. A reviewer needs no microscopic eyes to perceive in the history of those eventful years a number of great gaps. There is not, for example, so much as a single sentence alluding to the American claims against Mexico and their not very honorable management by our Government. The omission of a subject so important is not the ideal method of writing history, but is rather adapted to the requirements of the banquet hall and the holiday celebration. If there is a blot on the national escutcheon, it should be known in order that such offenses against international comity may not be repeated. So often and so generously has our great Republic encouraged and sustained afflicted humanity that it need not fear to acknowledge an act of aggression committed while its affairs were controlled by the slave power.

Though the frontispiece suggests that Lincoln was the grand personality of the decades covered by Professor Dodd, little is said of his endeavor to save the Union. So far as he had in advance considered any policy for his first administration, it was concerned with the Border States. Permanently to prevent their joining the Confederacy, he proposed to the people of that section a plan for the emancipation of slaves with compensation to their owners. This rejected offer is important because of its connection with the military emancipation announced in Septem-

ber, 1862. It is the first stage in his later purpose to free the slaves as a military measure.

Nothing is said of Lincoln's effort, through Andrew Johnson, to organize a loyal government in Tennessee after Grant's advance into the heart of that State. Nor is there any reference to the President's interest in Louisiana. Whatever may be thought of his policy with respect to Tennessee, Louisiana, and Arkansas, there can be no difference of opinion relative to the advantage to the Union cause of the division of Virginia, for the new State of West Virginia, organized in a manner not unworthy the notice of those interested in questions of constitutional interpretation, raised and equipped more than six and thirty regiments for the Federal armies. Other troops for the same cause were enlisted in Arkansas. In East Tennessee the Union sentiment was strong and during the conflict was manifest.

At one time it was much the fashion in the North to criticise Lincoln's plan of reconstruction and to praise that of Congress. The passions of that era having sunk to rest, events are now seen through a different medium. Lincoln's system, with its evident limitations, would have left the affairs of the South largely in the hands of its natural leaders. It was not his plan but one formed chiefly by a fusion of the "State suicide" theory of Sumner and the "conquered province" idea of Stevens that made possible the wild political orgies suggested by the terms carpet-bagger, Ku Klux, White Camelia, negro lawmaker, and legislative store. These institutions of outrage and plunder, together with a legacy of sectional hatred, were among the fruits of the Congressional plan of reconstruction.

The New Nation, the last of the four volumes, by Frederic L. Paxson, is an excellent narrative of the events following the war for Southern independence. The subjects discussed are chiefly economic and social, though there is included a satisfactory treatment of contemporary American politics and a suggestion of their tendencies. Foreign relations have not been overlooked. In fact, brief as is this work little of importance has been omitted. In it one sees nothing to criticise and much to praise. The maps and charts of this as well as of the preceding sections will be found of considerable use to the student, but in this place they cannot be separately described.

The Organizability of Labor. Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. By William O. Weyforth, Ph.D., Instructor in Economics in Western Reserve University. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1917.

The ordinary man who hears so much about trade unionism is surprised when he learns that only five and one-half per cent of the industrial population of this country belongs to trade unions and that only about eighteen per cent of the prospective candidates for labor organizations are actually organized. This naturally suggests the question why is it that a greater number of workers are not organized after all those years of struggle? A rather complete answer to this question will be found in Dr. Weyforth's excellent monograph. Before describing the obstacles in the way of the extension of labor organizations, the writer describes the methods adopted by labor organizations for the purpose of extending their membership. The simplest method of bringing men into the union is the direct appeal of the labor organizer. This is generally followed by a strike, when the employer refuses to grant the demands of the newly formed union. In order to strengthen further their organization, the trade unionists try to exclude non-union men from employment by the use of closed shop agreements.

According to Dr. Weyforth it is much easier to induce men to join the union than to have them retain their membership in it; hence it is, he claims, that the trade unions establish benefit systems. These give the members an additional interest in their union and gives the union a greater amount of control over them.

Poor leadership, dishonest local officials, reckless and unnecessary strikes, according to the writer have been a great source of weakness in the labor movement and have lead to the disruption of many unions.

The difficulties of getting men to join labor organizations are attributable both to the workers themselves and the character of the industry in which they are engaged. It is almost impossible to organize negro workers. The same is true of women workers. There are serious difficulties in the way of organizing recent immigrants, but Dr. Weyforth does not believe that they are insurmountable. It is exceedingly difficult to organize workers in small shops on account of the absence of that class conscious

spirit which is created by contact with others in the same station and with the same grievances. The great corporations like the American Paper Company, the American Tobacco Company and the United States Steel Corporation, have placed insuperable barriers in the way of labor organizations. Their great financial resources, their control of a large number of plants, their opportunities for discrimination, have enabled them to stamp out labor organizations from their industries.

Contemporary Theories of Unemployment and Unemployment Relief, Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law. By Frederick C. Mills, Ph.D. New York: Columbia University, 1917.

This monograph deals with three phases of the unemployment problem in England and the United States. The first chapter reviews briefly the various remedies for unemployment which have been tried in England from the sixteenth century to the present time. This chapter also contains a short discussion of the opinions of the classical economists on unemployment and unemployment relief, which logically belongs to the second chapter. The author's treatment of the British Poor Law is too brief to give the reader a clear idea of the forces leading to the establishment of this important institution. He has apparently studied it as an isolated phenomenon having no relation to social conditions or economic theory.

In the second chapter the writer reviews the current "Orthodox" theories in regard to unemployment in England. These are lack of industrial quality, industrial fluctuations, reserves of labor and personal faults. The various remedies suggested by "orthodox theorists" are also dealt with in this chapter, namely industrial education, dovetailing of seasonal industries, carrying on special government work in dull seasons, employment exchanges from which employers should be compelled to secure their workers, farm colonies for the unemployable and unemployment insurance. This chapter is the most instructive of the whole book. It gives one a clear concept of the amount of careful thought which has been devoted to the unemployment problem in England during the last quarter of a century.

Chapters three and four are devoted to American unemploy-

ment theory and practice. The author finds that up to a few years ago very little attention was devoted to the problem of unemployment in this country, and that recent studies of unemployment in this country are merely a repetition of English thought and English experience.

Collective Bargaining in the Lithographic Industry, Columbia University, Studies in History, Economics and Public Law. By. H. E. Hoagland, Ph.D. New York: Columbia University Press, 1917. Pp. 130.

In this monograph, which represents the results of an investigation made for the United States Commission on Industrial Relations, Mr. Hoagland makes a brief survey of the history of collective bargaining in a small but highly skilled trade. The writer admits at the very outset, that the Lithographic Industry has problems peculiar to itself, which detract from the value of his study for the student of the general labor field; but he contends, and rightly so, that it is only by studying each industry intensively, that we can get a firm grasp on the principles which form the basis of the labor contract. No student nowadays attempts to generalize in regard to the labor contract, without having made an intensive study of wage bargaining in some one industry.

Collective bargaining in the lithographic industry has passed through four stages. In the first stage, labor conditions were fixed by custom, in the second by union dictation, in the third by mutual agreement, and in the fourth by the dictation of a powerful employers' association. When the union was powerful it dictated the conditions of employment. After the employers had formed a rival organization there was a compromise. When the employer's organization became conscious of its strength, it made certain demands of the union which the latter refused, with the result that there was an appeal to economic force, resulting in a complete disruption of the union.

While containing many facts of interest to the student of labor problems, the monograph does not throw any new light on the principles of the wage contract. The author admits that apprenticeship is the cornerstone of the labor problem in the litho-

graphic industry, and yet his treatment of it is rather superficial. Again, it may be contended that experience with collective bargaining in Lithography is too short to justify conclusions of value to the student.

Separation of State and Local Revenues in the United States, Columbia University, Studies in History, Economics and Public Law. By Mabel Newcomer, Ph.D. New York: Columbia University Press, 1917. Pp. 195.

Since the beginning of the nineteenth century the general property tax has been the chief source of state revenue in the United States. In recent years, however, it has been discovered that this form of tax was not capable of meeting increased expenditures. In cases where the tax was increased, so as to yield the large revenue necessitated by the multiplication of state functions, it imposed excessive burdens on the owners of real estate. With the development of corporate organizations and intangible assets, students of public finance have come to prefer a tax on incomes to a general property tax. The opportunities for evading the general property tax are so manifold as to render it impractical.

Separation of local and state revenues in the United States has been the result of the movement to tax incomes rather than property. It has been deemed advisable to delegate to the state the administration of taxes on incomes and corporations, because the state can administer them more efficiently than the cities or counties. Other forms of taxation which cannot be so efficiently administered by the state have been left to its local subdivisions.

Dr. Newcomer's monograph describes this movement towards the separation of state and local revenues in Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, New Jersey and California. A special chapter is devoted to the movement in the United States as a whole. The work does not throw any new light on the development of state finance in this country. Its principal merit consists in bringing together the results of a number of specilized studies of taxation in the different states. For the benefit of those who are not specialists, the work might contain a clearer elucidation of the principles of taxation underlying the movement which the writer describes.

Economic and Social History of Chowan County, North Carolina, 1880-1915, Columbia University, Studies in History, Economics and Public Law. By W. Scott Boyce, Ph.D. New York: Columbia University Press, 1917. Pp. 293.

Mr. Boyce's monograph is most interesting. He answers every question which might be asked by the economist, sociologist or student of religion, about the people of a particular county in 1880 and again in 1915. He tells us about their methods of cultivating the soil, of planting different crops, of fishing, of stock-breeding; he describes the food they lived on, their houses, and their social and religious customs. But the most interesting feature of the book is his description of the changes which modern inventions have made in the life of the people. He studies in a most intensive way the contrast between their manner of living, their dwellings, their customs, social and religious, etc., in 1880 and in 1915. The monograph contains a specimen of the kind of history which modern sociologists have been demanding.

The Middle Group of American Historians. By John Spencer Bassett, Ph.D., LL.D., author of "A Short History of the United States," "The Life of Andrew Jackson," etc. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1917. Pp. xii+324.

American historical writing has been distinguished successively by three main characteristics. Prior to the Revolution the colonial spirit naturally predominated. In this period each historian was interested almost exclusively in the origin and growth of his own colony. The early record of Virginia, outside the brief narratives of the early settlers, has been left us by Robert Beverly and William Stith. In New England the most prominent writers of the period were Bradford, Winthrop, Price, and Hutchinson. Besides these may be mentioned Colden of New York, Samuel Smith of New Jersey, and John Lawson of North Carolina. The impulse to write history was felt more strongly in New England than in the other colonies. Here, more frequently than elsewhere, writers rose to tell the story of the past that posterity might not forget the struggles and hardships of earlier years.

The second or middle period of American historical endeavor was ruled chiefly by the patriotic impulse. It may be said to

begin with the end of the Revolution and to extend to a time not long subsequent to the Civil War, namely, to the time when the modern and scientific spirit secured dominance.

It is the middle period that receives treatment in the volume under review. The reader can hardly escape the impression that Dr. Bassett is an impartial critic. While not overlooking the merits of our chief historians of the middle group, he is nevertheless sensible of the defects in their writings; and his observations on this point confirm the views held for a long time that unreserved trust cannot be placed in historians like Bancroft, Prescott, Motley and Sparks.

Histories produced at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century were written in the afterglow of the Revolution. "We were all partisans of our own cause in the contest with Great Britain," says Dr. Bassett, "and, whether we wished to know its simple history or to read the biographies of its leaders, we demanded narratives that stimulated self-satisfaction." Writers of national and state histories and biographies "had more zeal than industry and were guilty of gross neglect of the sources of information" (p. 16). Weem's *Life of Washington* (1800) had a tremendous sale. Yet this and his subsequent biographies of Marion, Franklin and Penn "were full of inaccuracies. In fact, no writer of biography in America ever drew more freely on his imagination in composing his books. What he did not know he invented, if it seemed good to him. . . . His works are utterly worthless as books of fact, but he drew vivid pictures of what he thought Washington, Franklin and Marion ought to be" (p. 21). Of the writers of this period Jeremy Belknap and Ebenezer Hazard, by their industry and impartiality, approached nearest the modern ideal of history.

Abiel Homes, Benjamin Trumbull and Timothy Ritkin wrote histories of the United States (1805, 1810, 1828), all distinguished for some merit, yet so deficient in general worth that they are now held in slight esteem. It was with the idea of making up for the defects in their works that Bancroft was induced to begin his history. Washington Irving's historical volumes (published from 1809–1859) are void of the modern spirit, yet were composed "with enough accuracy to satisfy the

age in which he wrote" (p. 23). Charles Etienne Arthur Gayarré, author of a "History of Louisiana," though at times giving free range to his fancy, takes high rank among the historians of the middle period.

Outside the introduction of about fifty pages on the development of our history prior to the Civil War, Dr. Bassett's volume is devoted exclusively to the public and literary careers of Sparks, Bancroft, Prescott, Motley and Peter Force. These he considers the most eminent characters of the group concerned.

Jared Sparks' early bent was toward mathematics, natural history and theology. First a school teacher, then a minister, he gave up both professions, and became in 1823 editor of the *North American Review*. It was while thus occupied that the idea came to him of publishing an edition of the Writings of Washington. After considerable difficulty he secured in 1827 Washington's bulky correspondence preserved at Mt. Vernon and took it to Boston. With such a vast quantity of valuable historical material in his possession Sparks was dazzled by the opportunities opening before him; and before the "Washington" was completed in 1837 he had undertaken six other books. All these were brought out at various intervals before 1840. The most interesting part of Sparks' career are his visits to domestic and foreign archives in search of historical documents for the completion of his works. His *Life and Writings of George Washington* (12 volumes) appeared between 1834 and 1837, and is his best known work. It was for a long time our chief authority on the life of Washington. Yet it is full of defects. Sparks thought that a sacred halo surrounded the life of a great man. "Holding this view, and many men besides Sparks held it in 1830, he could not make up his mind to paint Washington with small faults. He altered Washington's language and became liable to a charge of perverting the truth. But for this failing Sparks could be called the father of the modern school of American History" (p. 100).

While Sparks was busy with his volumes on the Revolution, George Bancroft was engaged upon his *History of the United States from the Discovery of the American Continent*. Bancroft's career as professor at Harvard and later as school master at Northampton had not been entirely to his liking, and about

1831, he turned his attention to the more congenial task of writing history. The first volume of his great work appeared in 1834. The remaining nine volumes were published between this date and 1875. The last volume completed the story of the Revolution. Bancroft's *History* made a great impression. It at once placed him first among living historians of our country. Yet today, as Dr. Bassett observes, Bancroft's history is out of date, and a changing age treats it with disdain. His chief fault, in the estimation of our critic, is his lack of detachment—"strongly partisan by nature and deeply imbued with the love of American independence, he glorified the struggle of the revolutionary fathers, and saw no good in the position taken by king and parliament. He crystallized all the hero worship of the old Fourth of July school into a large work written in a style acceptable to the time" (pp. 183–84).

In William H. Prescott we have a good example of steadfast devotion to the task of writing history amid trying difficulties. He resolved that a defective eyesight should not deter him from literary work. His *Ferdinand and Isabella* was brought out in 1836; *The Conquest of Mexico* in 1843; and the *Conqueror of Peru* in 1847. Prescott wrote according to the uncritical ideals of his age. From the present day standpoint his books have many limitations. His object was to produce a spirited and dramatic narrative in which there was unity of thought and purpose moving to a climax (p. 217). He did not write history as we now understand it, and his works on the Spanish relations have been superseded by others more in accord with the modern spirit.

There is perhaps even less of modern spirit in John Lathrop Motley than in Prescott. The *Rise of the Dutch Republic* (1856) and the *History of United Netherlands* (1860–68) give evidence of deep research, but are full of coloring. Like Bancroft and others, Motley had not the true historian's sense of detachment. "He frankly took sides. He hated the absolute government of the Spanish monarchy, he disliked the dogmas of the Roman Church, and he could not abide the repressive spirit of the Roman hierarchy. His histories were Protestant through and through. He drew Philip the Second as black as he could, but no blacker than Protestants have drawn him. Through many decades Motley was a one-sided historian" (p. 229).

The last career that receives treatment in Dr. Bassett's interesting volume is that of Peter Force, the compiler. In 1833, Force and his partner Clark, both of whom were printers, secured from the government a contract by which for a stipulated amount they were to publish a documentary history of the United States. Only nine volumes, however, of what was intended to be a vast series known as the *American Archives* ever appeared. Difficulties arose over the government contract and the publication was suspended in 1857, much to Force's disappointment. Force can hardly be called a historian, but he was an indefatigable collector. In this way he was of great service to the historians of his day. Had he been able to carry through properly his original design he would have produced a documentary history of immense service to future historians of our country. His *American Archives*, says Dr. Bassett, is now nearly forgotten: "It is not even a model for the many collections that have been published since its day. Its arrangement is poor, being entirely mechanical" (p. 272). Force's vast and valuable collection of historical material passed in 1867 to the Library of Congress.

Not the least interesting chapter of Dr. Bassett's book is the last showing the arrangements of early historians with their publishers. The profession of historian is less profitable now than in the days of Sparks, Bancroft, Motley, Irving and Prescott. It is perhaps not too much to say that the transition from popular to scientific history has not yet been fully accomplished so far as the reading public is concerned. This may explain the fact that, despite the growth of our population and the emphasis now given to the teaching of history, present day historians do not command the same degree of respect from the public that our historians of the middle group commanded in their day.

Dr. Bassett has written a useful book, and we hope that health and length of years will enable him to realize his design mentioned in the preface of producing a larger work allotted to other historians within the middle period.

New York as an Eighteenth Century Municipality. (Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University.) No. 1, Prior to 1731. By Arthur Everett Peterson, Ph.D. No. 2, 1731 to 1776. By George William Edwards, Ph.D. New York: Columbia University (Longmans, Green & Co., Agents), 1917.

These two volumes, of approximately two hundred pages each, form numbers 177 and 178 of the *Columbia Series of Studies in History, Economics and Public Law.* Both writers have in in this instance the advantage of experience in the teaching of history, a fact which goes far to account for the clearness and method with which a rather vast and varied collection of facts is presented. There is a special reason for welcoming these volumes, namely, that the series is not so rich as one might reasonably look to find it, in work on New York City history. It is to be hoped that more will be done in this department as there are opportunities here not presented by many other American cities, and the material is not hard to obtain for one so situated as a student of Columbia. For instance, New York is the only one of the more important settlements along the Atlantic seaboard not originally English and the efforts to harmonize the diverse elements of Dutch and English are apparent in its career even beyond the War of Independence. Thus the political animosity embittering the early days of the State government, engendering a confusion so great as to prevent the choice of Presidential Electors in 1789 and thereby depriving New York of the honor of voting for Washington at his first election, is fundamentally a heritage of the ancient Anglo-Dutch rivalry, as the very names of the contending factions (Schuyler, Clinton, Stuyvesant) would readily suggest. It may even be (but this view must be presented with considerable reserve) that the present state of the Republican Party in the city may have its remote source here, though of course the lines of cleavage have long since been altered out of all semblance to such an origin. Moreover, while the Catholic history of the colony is for long periods almost a blank, the darkness is illumined by at least two brilliant names, Jogues and Dongan; the city's position as the first National Capital caused it to loom large in the early days of the Republic, and the abortive attempt at secession in

1861 is significant even if not highly honorable. It can scarcely be necessary to continue these remarks further; our only reason for them is the hope that the editors of the Columbia Series will bring out a greater proportion of studies in a field so rich and in which their own University has played so prominent and worthy a part.

In the present number the subject, limited as it is, is still further narrowed and the treatment proportionately clarified by being divided into two sections, taking 1731 (the date of the Montgomerie Charter) as the boundary. The first volume, by Professor Peterson, covers the period from the granting of the charter to New Amsterdam by the Dutch East India Company in 1653 to the Montgomerie Charter; the second by Professor Edwards, continues the narrative to the War of Independence. the latter volume is perhaps of more interest as it deals with the form of government that remained in substance for the first half-century after the separation from England, and constituted the basis for subsequent alterations. It thus comes home to us a little more closely, though the Charter of 1731 was itself largely an extension of former grants and privileges.

In writing of the period prior to 1731 Dr. Peterson wisely devotes only a scant dozen pages to the Dutch rule. We say "wisely" not only because to have gone into that portion more fully would have left him open to the charge of a too wide interpretation of "seventeenth century," but equally because the political organization of the city down to Governor Dongan's time is rather remote from that which follows. So great in fact was the alteration, not in outward form alone but in spirit, introduced into the city affairs in 1686 that the continuity was almost broken. A new machinery was brought into being, and to understand it little more than an outline knowledge suffices as fas as its predecessor is concerned. The slowness with which this was done would suffice to absolve the English from any desire to gratify their pride as conquerors. The change from Dutch to English methods was effected not because the former were Dutch but because they were outgrown and had become truly alien. At first there was no manifest desire to depart from the old accustomed ways, and to contemporaries of the English occupation it may have seemed that these old ways would con-

tinue indefinitely to be trod. The liberal attitude of the Duke of York himself, a dislike amounting almost to detestation of Stuyvesant's harsh government, and a fair sprinkling of English residents, were factors tending considerably to smoothe what might otherwise have proved a violent and rough transition. It was some months before even the names of the officials were Englished; the records continued for a long time to be kept in Dutch; and all things considered it must be owned that public affairs continued to be managed pretty much as they had been before the coming of the British fleet. But on their return nine years later (1673) the Dutch showed not quite so broad a spirit. Though there was little in the essential nature of the government they could meddle with (since it was in large measure what had existed under their own rule) they contrived to alter the political atmosphere to no small degree by practically limiting political functions to Dutch residents of the Reformed Church. The restoration of the colony to England in the next year meant little beyond restoring to a share in power those whom the narrow policy of the Dutch had excluded, and on to 1686 the old forms continued. This last date, the year when the Dongan Charter was granted, is that at which the real subject matter of the present study begins.

This charter had been in operation nearly three years before its formal signing by the Duke of York, having been tentatively adopted by Governor Dongan in December, 1683, "until such Time as his Royall highness pleasure shall be ffurther knowne therein," so that we are not doing overmuch honor to the first Catholic governor of New York when we link it with his name. When we bear in mind the fact that at this very time not only were the ancient rights and privileges of English cities imperilled but the neighboring colonies as well were being subjected to Crown government and that even the Province of New York itself did not succeed in securing royal assent to the charter framed for it by Governor Dongan in the same year (1683), the liberal form of administration conceded to the city is the more astonishing and the more welcome. For some reason the Duke instructed Dongan to grant the city a greater measure of liberty than was allowed elsewhere, and the instructions were well followed. The members of the Common Council were constituted

a corporation under the name of "the mayor, Aldermen and Commonalty of ye Citty of New York." The Mayor was appointed by the Governor of the Province, as were also the Town Clerk and the Sheriff; the Aldermen were elected by the Wards and had the appointing of other officials, such as the Chamberlain. The Common Council had power to make laws for the city, these laws to hold valid for three months (this is why there is so frequent mention in the Council Records of the re-enactment of laws, which is the method whereby the restriction on law-making power was evaded and the laws rendered practically perpetual), but of course nothing might be enacted contrary to English or Provincial law. In short, New York was provided with a considerable amount of "home rule" during the reign of a Prince whose name is not usually associated with liberal tendencies. And to this large measure of freedom must be ascribed much of the credit for the growth in commercial importance that became so noticeable toward the close of the Colonial Period, and which led a writer to the *Newport Mercury* in 1770 to predict that the city at the mouth of the Hudson would one day outstrip even Newport as an emporium of trade. Though this wild prophecy was eventually fulfilled it was not until some years after the separation from England that New York attained the first rank in American commerce; still the germ of this achievement may be discerned early in the eighteenth century. For that matter the settlement had been from the outset commercial and much of what is now regarded as "picturesque" in its early days was in reality dictated by prosaic business needs. But its admirable situation would not have sufficed to encourage this growth without the support of free government; and of this it secured not only the seed but a goodly measure of the fruit, from the last of the Stuarts.

There was, however, one weakness in the Dongan Charter. Granted by James II when he was Duke of York, it had not received the royal assent. The question of its validity in law could, therefore, be raised, and was raised, though it does not appear that any practical inconvenience resulted from this technical irregularity. Still the point was deemed of sufficient importance to justify a settlement and was one of the reasons urged when a new charter was requested in 1730. Some extension of

powers was sought, among them being the right to elect the Mayor and certain other officers. This part of the petition was, apparently, motived more by an abstract devotion to the forms of liberty than by any grievance that could be alleged. Though the inhabitants had to take the Mayor the Governor gave them they had no ground for complaint; down to 1776 the Mayors of New York were creditable men, so much so as to be not infrequently reappointed. So that nothing was lost through the fact that the power to elect the Mayor was kept out of the hands of the people, and was not conceded to them until as late as 1834, when the long-continued agitation of the Tammany Society was crowned with success and the series of popularly-elected Mayors begins. But though they failed in this, the petitioners of 1730 obtained their other requests, this being facilitated by a vote to Governor Montgomerie of fourteen hundred pounds. But, strange to say, even this charter remained without the royal signature. The very Governor whose name it bears never signed it, so that one of the principal defects of the old charter to be remedied by the new one remained, and in an aggravated form. This caused difficulty down to comparatively recent times, and the matter was set at rest only by a decision of the Supreme Court of the State affirming the validity of the Charter of 1731.

These two documents form the basis of the study presented in the volumes before us. For this reason the student may regret that the writers did not give the respective texts verbatim. This would not have greatly increased the size of the volumes; for though, like such documents of the period generally, they are somewhat verbose and filled with a good deal of extraneous material, the essential passages could have been given in small type at the end. For the present, the student will find the Dongan Charter in *The Memorial History of New York* (New York, 1892), Vol. i, pp. 437–446, with a photograph of part of the original at p. 551. The Montgomerie Charter is summarized in the same work, Vol. ii, p. 193, and a facsimile (incomplete) is on p. 198. The omission of these documents is the only defect (if it is a defect) that is serious enough to call for much comment, though there are some points of minor importance that must not pass unnoticed. The Catholic reader will probably be disappointed at the slight attention given to the status of the Church of

England in Colonial New York. Again and again we are told that this body was "established" there, though every historian knows that such a statement is quite unhistorical, its sole foundation being Governor Fletcher's interpretation of the Act of the Assembly of 1693. This is conceded by Dr. Tiffany in his *History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America*, pp. 165–166 (New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1895), but the wording of the charter of the Trinity Corporation tends to keep the notion alive. This is not treated in either volume, though Professor Edwards devotes a paragraph to the position, social and religious, of the Anglican Communion in the colonial days (pp. 54–55). The absence of an Index and some overlapping (unavoidable, perhaps, in work of collaboration) make up the total of what even the most captious critic would find to object to. On the other hand there is a vast deal to praise. Without any attempt at being "picturesque" the authors have contrived to make interesting and at times amusing a study that in less skillful hands might have been tedious and dry. There are pages that Janvier could have written, though we would not create the impression that the work is anything below a serious contribution to historical investigation. The portions dealing with economic topics (Vol. i, Chapters ii and viii, and Vol. ii, Chapters iii and ix) are especially well done; and here and there a common but mistaken belief, as, *e. g.*, that Bowling Green dates from the period of Dutch occupation, is disposed of with gentleness as well as with finality. As a whole these volumes, though but indirectly bearing on the subjects that interest students of American Church History, are products of genuine and painstaking scholarship and entirely worthy a place in the series whereof they form a part.

The Catholic Encyclopedia and its Makers. New York: The Encyclopedia Press, 1917. Pp. viii+192.

From the first appearance of this valuable handbook, it was called, as it justly deserved to be, an international *Catholic Who's Who*. It is better than any volume which bears that title, for the biographical sketches are heightened in value with portraits of its contributors. No great work by Catholics in

modern times received a more cordial reception than the *Catholic Encyclopedia*. The non-Catholic religious press was almost unanimous in praising the project, one publication speaking of it as the "greatest work undertaken for the advancement of Christian knowledge since the days of Trent." The value of this volume can hardly be exaggerated, for it brings the host of readers who daily read the *Encyclopedia* into the circle of the most scholarly men and women in the Catholic Church throughout the world. No man of our day can estimate the full extent of the *Encyclopedia's* influence for good, and this volume takes us behind the scenes as it were and shows us in a flash the magnitude of a project which, completed today, stands unrivalled in the world.

History of the Civil War (1861-1865). By James Ford Rhodes. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1917. Pp. 454, with maps. Price, $2.50.

In the space of a single volume of moderate size Mr. Rhodes carefully discusses the military, naval, diplomatic, financial, and social history of the Civil War, a struggle which in its later stage was continued rather for Southern independence than for the extension or the protection of the institution of slavery. While his conclusions are beyond reasonable criticism and his maps of forts, marches, and campaigns are excellent, occasionally there is an hiatus in the narrative and sometimes an unexpected brevity of treatment. Having thoroughly considered the entire subject in his great history, the author does not appear to have felt the necessity of again exhaustively describing themes which he had once adequately examined. The reviewer's ideas will, perhaps, be better understood by giving a few illustrations.

In referring to the ordinance of secession which was termed a Declaration of Independence of the State of South Carolina the fact is passed without observation that the delegates were by no means unanimous in their enumeration of the causes which impelled them to the separation. An examination of this circumstance makes interesting and not unprofitable reading for the student of American constitutional history.

On page 24 it is stated that the Virginia convention passed an ordinance of secession by a vote of 103 to 46. The present

reviewer has always seen the vote given as 88 to 55, and the useful comment added that the minority delegates were chiefly from the trans-Alleghany counties. Strange to say, there is in this work no treatment of the organization of West Virginia and its admission as a distinct commonwealth. On whatever ground an account of this interesting event is excluded, however, there is no doubt that the new State was a source of military strength to the Union cause. There is, indeed, an allusion to the existence at Alexandria of the feeble government of Francis Harrison Pierpont, but nothing is said of the admission to Congress of a Representative and two Senators from that fragment of the Old Dominion. What is very remarkable about the status of that commonwealth is that when one of its Senators died while in office, his successor was not admitted. In a word, that feeble community was entitled to but *one* Senator in Congress. This revolutionary proceeding should have been noticed.

The author's estimate of General Beauregard is hardly as complimentary as the record of that officer's achievements would appear to justify. At the first Bull Run he was superseded. General Joseph E. Johnston, a superb soldier and chivalrous gentleman, took over the command of Beauregard *after* the former engagement, while Albert Sidney Johnston, an officer by some even more highly esteemed than the Eastern commander, began the great battle of Shiloh. When Beauregard, because of the death of his superior, was in command, he could hardly have known that Buell would have been punctual and Van Dorm behindhand. Doctor Rhodes should have explained why Lee or Davis failed to assist Beauregard in capturing or destroying Butler's army at Drury's Bluff. The situation contained undoubted elements of success. Why were they unimproved? When the Confederacy was tottering to its fall, the services of Beauregard appear to have been in greater request than they were in the season of its triumph.

In discussing Lincoln's plan of gradual emancipation of slaves with compensation to owners nothing is said of his endeavor to have the offer of Congress accepted by Delaware, a small State in which it was thought best to begin the experiment. The reasons for its rejection by Delaware make interesting reading. Nor is there made in this study any mention of

the enlightened support of the principle of compensated emancipation by Senator John B. Henderson, of Missouri. For his sagacity and patriotism that statesman should not have been passed without notice.

If this work is designed for the general reader, in parts it is incomplete; on the other hand, if it is intended for the professional student of American history, its contents are already familiar.

The Formation of the State of Oklahoma (University of California Press), by R. Gittinger, Ph.D. (pp. i–vii, 1–256).

This objective history presents the ethnographical and political development of the State of Oklahoma from the time of the Louisiana Purchase in 1803 until the passage of the enabling act in June, 1906.

The author is professor of English History and Dean of Undergraduates in the University of Oklahoma. His book offers ample evidence that he is painstaking and judicious in his research work, logical and clear in his method of exposition and capable of presenting a complex and arid subject in a correct and limpid style. And because in the compilation of official documents and in the redaction of this volume he acknowledges the assistance of such eminent authorities on the history of the southwest as Professors Herbert E. Bolton, Joseph B. Thoburn and several others, his work stands out as the most authoritative and the most accurate on the formation of the state of Oklahoma.

After Congress had organized the territories of Louisiana in 1812 and of Arkansas in 1819, the Quapaws entered into a first treaty by which a considerable tract of land situated in the present state of Oklahoma was ceded to the Choctaws. They were followed by the Creeks and Cherokees and the country was definitely set apart for the southern Indians. However, the western half of the state was then a part of the hunting grounds of the Kiowa, Comanche and Wichita Indians, and to forestall trouble with new occupants a great council was held in 1835, as a result of which what is now Oklahoma was divided by a line drawn north and south almost through its center. In later years the eastern half was considered the territory of the civilized tribes, and the western half that of the "blanket" Indians. It

then became the policy of the Government under President Jackson to reserve the country west of Missouri and Arkansas exclusively for communities established by the Indians themselves or by the United States. But by the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and the organization of Nebraska and Kansas, the boundaries of the original extensive Indian Territory, west of the Mississippi river, were reduced to the limits of the present state of Oklahoma. After the Civil War, Kansas succeeded in having most of the Indians removed to the Indian Territory, while many of its citizens and people of the Southern States began to urge upon Congress the opening of this territory to white settlers. And the Government, under the pretext that the Five Civilized Tribes had taken part in the war between the Union and the Southern Confederacy, deprived the Indians of their exclusive rights within its limits and gradually secured the surrender of territory for the use of other Indians. After the occupation of the best land in Kansas, settlers began to make persistent efforts to occupy the unassigned land in the Indian Territory. Payne's first appearance as leader of a band of settlers, called "boomers," occurred in 1880. The Government and the courts were unable to stop the invasions. After the adoption of the Dawes act and of various provisions for the opening of the Oklahoma district on April 22, 1889, the reservations in the western part were divided into freeholds for the citizens of the United States. Successive openings for settlement took place until 1901 in the western half of the Indian Territory, which was organized as the Territory of Oklahoma. Soon afterward the agitation for statehood began, and, after the dissolution of the Five Civilized Tribes of the Indian Territory, it culminated on November 16, 1907, in the issuance by President Roosevelt of a proclamation declaring that the combined Oklahoma and Indian Territories were on that date admitted into the Union under the name of State of Oklahoma. This event took place 104 years after its acquisition by the United States as a part of the Louisiana Purchase. And while Oklahoma was not organized as a distinctive Indian state, yet it counts among its citizens one-third of the total Indian population of the United States.

Those various stages in the transformation of the original Indian Territory into the present prosperous and progressive

state of Oklahoma are described without superfluous commentaries, but with a simple, authenticated reference to the concomitant circumstances, in twelve chapters followed by nine appendixes reproducing some of the most important official documents. An excellent and detailed index of much practical value, and five maps, complete this book. The typographical work is of the high standard maintained by the University of California Press; it is faultless. The book is neatly bound in durable buckram. Of the *University of California Publications in History* it is the sixth volume, and one of the most creditable and most important.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC WAR COUNCIL

On November 21, 1917, His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons addressed a letter to the American Hierarchy proposing the formation of a new National Catholic War Council. This letter was the result of an informal conference of the Archbishops and Bishops present at the semi-annual meeting of the Catholic University Trustees. The response of the American Hierarchy was unanimous; and on December 19, 1917, His Eminence addressed a second letter to the Archbishops suggesting the formation of an Administrative Committee for the actual management of the National Catholic War Council. The hearty endorsement of the Archbishops followed, and the following Bishops were named: the Right Rev. P. J. Muldoon, D.D., Bishop of Rockford, *Chairman;* the Right Rev. J. Schrembs, D.D., Bishop of Toledo, the Right Rev. P. J. Hayes, D.D., Auxiliary Bishop of New York, and the Right Rev. William T. Russell, D.D., Bishop of Charleston, S. C. The first meeting of this Administrative Committee was held at the Catholic University, on January 16, 1918. In his letter of January 12, 1918, calling the Administrative Committee together, Cardinal Gibbons defined the task ahead of the four Bishops: namely, to direct and control, with the aid of the American Hierarchy, all Catholic activities in the war.

With the Declaration of War against the Central Powers, every part of the organization of the Church immediately became solicitous to do its share in assisting the Government. Activities of all kinds were begun in various parts of the country, and individual as well as corporate cooperation with such movements as the Belgian Relief, the Red Cross, the Liberty Loan, and others, became the watchword. The number of enlisted and drafted men opened the eyes of Catholics throughout the United States to the large quota of their coreligionists in the Army and Navy, and it was felt that every effort should be made for their welfare. Before the first contingent of men in the Service had been completed, it was common talk that the percentage of Catholics in the Service, both at home and overseas, was out of all proportion to the number of Catholics in the country. How to cope with the problem of cooperating with the Government and with private societies for their welfare became the paramount question.

That a National Catholic organization of some sort was necessary soon became apparent, and in August, 1917, a *National Catholic War Council of the United States of America* was created. Its object was as follows: to promote the spiritual and material welfare of the United States troops during the war wherever they may be, at home, or abroad, and to study, coordinate, unify and put in operation all Catholic activities incidental to the war.

This War Council, known now as the *Old Catholic War Council*, consisted of:

1. A *National Council* composed of representatives named by the Archbishops and Bishops of the dioceses of the United States;
2. A *Local Council* consisting of members appointed by the Ordinary of each diocese in such numbers as he should deem proper;

3. An *Executive Committee* consisting of one clerical and one lay member appointed by each Archbishop of the United States from his province; and of members-at-large, not to exceed three in number, appointed by the Executive Committee.

At the first meeting of the Executive Committee at the Catholic University, on August 11–12, 1917, the following resolutions were passed:

Resolved, That it is the unanimous opinion of this Convention that the Catholics of the United States should devote their united energies to promote the spiritual and material welfare of the United States troops during the war, wherever they may be, at home, or abroad, and should create a National Organization to study, coordinate, unify, and put in operation all Catholic activities incidental to the war;

Resolved, That in order to effect this National coordination, a Committee of seven be appointed by the Chairman of this Convention to devise a plan of organizing, throughout the United States, a National body to be called *The National Catholic War Council*. We suggest that this Council be made up of *Local Councils* in each Diocese, to consist of the Ordinary of the Diocese and the two Delegates to this Convention and such others as the Ordinary may designate; a *National Council* composed of members from all the Dioceses in the United States appointed by the Ordinaries; and an *Executive Committee* of one Delegate from each Archdiocese to be appointed by the Archbishop; that this Organization be completed and put in operation without further report to this Convention and that the Executive Committee be authorized to collect such funds as may be necessary for the above-mentioned purposes.

Meanwhile, the Government had asked the Knights of Columbus to cooperate in the work of the moral welfare of the men in service. The following Resolution was therefore passed by this meeting:

Resolved, That this Convention most heartily commends the excellent work which the Knights of Columbus have undertaken in cooperating with the Government of the United States in meeting the moral problems which have arisen and will arise out of the war, and it is the opinion of this Convention that the Knights of Columbus should be recognized as the representative Catholic body for the special work they have undertaken.

This first War Council then pledged itself to give its best efforts in safeguarding the moral and spiritual welfare of our Catholic young men in the Service. Its members held themselves in readiness to cooperate in the work under the spiritual leadership of the Hierarchy. They placed on record their hearty approbation of the admirable regulations made by our War and Navy Department for the safeguarding of our camps, cantonments, naval and military establishments from the moral dangers incident to camp life.

The Committees appointed at that time were:

Committee on Finance.
Committee on Publicity and Information.
Committee on Chaplains.

Committee on Recreation and Recreation Halls.
Committee on Literature and Religious Articles.
Committee on Legislation.
Committee on Historical Records of Catholic War Activities.
Committee on Women's Organizations.

The creation of this first War Council, as we read in its first printed *Handbook*, "was the result of a widespread realization that the transfer of hundreds of thousands of Catholic men from normal to abnormal conditions of living should cause deep solicitude. There is the desire that the Catholic soldier should have ample opportunity for leading a Catholic life, which involves attendance at Mass and reception of the Sacraments; and there is apprehension concerning the moral and physical welfare of the soldier in the presence of evils which seems to be intensified under the new conditions of living." Among the problems taken up for consideration were: Enlistment Period, Aggregation Camps, Mobilization Camps, Knights of Columbus Halls, Recreation Accessories, Camp Life in France, Families of Soldiers in Service, Training Camp Dangers, a National Catholic Budget for the work, Methods of Forming Diocesan War Councils, etc.

The officers of the old War Council were:

President, Rev. John J. Burke, C. S. P., 120 West 60th St., N. Y.
Secretary, Robert Biggs, Law Building, Baltimore.
Treasurer, John G. Agar, 31 Nassau Street, New York.

The chairmen of the Committees were:

Chaplains, Rt. Rev. Msgr. M. J. Lavelle, New York.
Legislation and By-Laws, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Ed. Kelly, Chicago.
Finance, John G. Agar, New York.
Historical Record of Catholic War Activities, Rt. Rev. Msgr. H. T. Drumgoole, Philadelphia.
Recreation and Rest Halls, Charles I. Denechaud, New Orleans.
Women's Organizations, Rt. Rev. Msgr. M. J. Splaine, Boston.
Executive Secretary, Walter G. Hooke, New York.

Consequently, when the new National Catholic War Council was formed, under the direction of Cardinal Gibbons, the Administrative Committee took advantage of the work done by the Executive Committee of the old War Council and by the Knights of Columbus. The new War Council met for the first time, as proposed, on January 16, 1918, and the projects of the old War Council together with the Knights of Columbus activities were fused into the new organization. The plan of organization adopted was as follows:

I. The National Catholic War Council, composed of the fourteen Archbishops.

II. Administrative Committee, composed of the four Bishops.

I. *Committee on Special War Activities.*
II. *Knights of Columbus Committee on War Activities.*

III. Executive Committee, composed of the four Bishops, six members of Knights of Columbus War Council and six members of the old Catholic War Council.

IV. General Committee, composed of two representatives, one clerical and one lay, from each diocese, two representatives from the American Federation of Catholic Societies, two representatives from each National Catholic society, two representatives from the Catholic Press Association, and such other members-at-large as the Committee of Bishops may choose.

The following reorganization of the Committee on Special War Activities was effected:

I. Committee on Finance.
II. Committee on Women's Activities.
III. Committee on Men's Activities.
IV. Committee on After-War Work.
V. Committee on Chaplains.
VI. Committee on Publicity.
VII. Committee on Historical Records of Catholic War Activities.

A central Bureau was secured and is now located at 930–932 Fourteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

The *Committee on Historical Records* was placed in charge of the Rt. Rev. H. T. Drumgoole, LL.D., D.D., Rector of St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Pa. Monsignor Drumgoole appointed as his Secretary, the Rev. Dr. Peter Guilday, *associate* professor of American Church History, at the Catholic University. The following letter and *Questionnaire* were sent to all the pastors of churches throughout the United States:

The National Catholic War Council

Committee on Historical Records of Catholic War Activities

932 14TH STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

CHAIRMAN
RT. REV. MGR. H. T. DRUMGOOLE, D.D., LL.D.
SECRETARY
REV. PETER GUILDAY, PH.D.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC WAR RECORDS

The National Catholic War Council was organized by the Hierarchy of the United States, primarily, to insure proper spiritual service for all Catholics in the Army, Navy and Marine Corps of the United States; secondarily, to stimulate and coordinate all Catholic activities for the success of American arms in the war; thirdly, to prevent or remedy untoward conditions growing out of the war.

The National Catholic War Council consists of the fourteen Metropolitans of the United States. It acts through an Administrative Committee of four Bishops, appointed by the Metropolitans. An Executive Committee of priests and laymen from all parts of the country carry out the practical work, through a number of Standing Committees.

The Committee on National Catholic War Records, one of the standing Committees, has been directed by the Administrative Committee of Bishops to bend every effort to secure at once and to preserve an accurate and complete record of all Catholic American activity in the present war.

The securing of such a record will require the generous assistance of all Catholics, especially the aid and the sympathetic cooperation of every Bishop and Priest, particularly of every Pastor, the heads of Catholic Societies of men and women, and the editors of Catholic papers and magazines.

An individual appeal, therefore, is now made to you to do your share, large or small as it may be, to insure the success of our efforts to gather Catholic War Records. Proper War Records will go far to guarantee and facilitate adequate spiritual ministrations to our men in military service. They will show the needs of the men's families and dependents, during and after the war, and afford material for an inspiring chapter in the story of the Church's religious and patriotic cooperation in our national crisis.

The National Board for Historical Service, which has been created by a select group of scholars for present war needs, has called the attention "of State historical departments and societies and other public bodies, to the importance of preserving for permanent use the war records not only of the State and Federal Governments, but also of the large number of auxiliary organizations." It is "seeking information as to the attitude of particular social groups, political, racial, economic or religious," and its plans "include the publication of manual of war records." Our War Records can be made the contribution and answer of Catholics, and our War Records must be thorough and adequate in order that the Church find its place in the Nation's summary of War Service as proposed in this plan.

We desire to secure at once the name, age, home address, branch of service, and the name and address of nearest relative or next friend.

(*a*) *Of every Catholic man in the Army, Navy or Marines of the United States* (*state whether volunteer or drafted*);

(*b*) *Of those examined and passed, even though not yet called to service*;

(*c*) *Of those serving in medical, hospital or ambulance corps*;

(*d*) *Of chaplains, regular, non-commissioned, or supplying*;

(*e*) *Of helpers in cantonment, camps, or over-seas*;

(*f*) *Of every Catholic woman serving as nurse or in any other capacity*.

Further information and material desired for war records may be broadly defined as follows:

Episcopal pronouncements, acts, addresses, books, pamphlets; Priests' efforts of like character; Church celebrations, prayers; congregational celebrations, activities; group or individual participation on part of either clergy or laity.

Hence, Diocesan National War Council organization of Societies, National or Local, co-ordinated for War Work, and outline of work accomplished or contemplated, co-ordinated for present war work.

(*a*) *With K. of C. in raising of funds, amount contributed by Diocese or individuals, help in camp or extra-camp activities*;

(*b*) *With Red Cross, amount of contributions, number of memberships, branches, with number of workers and amount of work handed in, if no branch is established, statement whether private organization does work*;

(*c*) *With Food Conservation, method of cooperation*;

(*d*) *With Federal, State or Municipal War Measures*;

(*e*) *With chaplain aid or similar associations, amounts raised or contributed, supplies furnished chaplains, kits, altar supplies, literature, etc.*

A special Questionnaire will be sent respectively for all Catholic men's and women's societies.

Letters from soldiers, or about soldiers, newspaper or magazine articles treating of Catholics in war activity, are greatly desired.

Arrangements have been made to secure copies of every Catholic paper and magazine in the United States.

In some places a Diocesan War Record is being compiled in the home Chancery. This is likely to be accurate and thorough, and will afford a splendid history for home reading; a copy will aid us greatly.

An appeal is made to the Right Reverend Ordinaries for every suggestion and help they can give for the direction and success of the War Records, and every priest is earnestly urged to co-operate in every way possible.

Every bit of help in compiling the National Catholic War Records will count for the honor of Church and Country, and for the glory of the men who are offering their life's blood, and of the women who, in their husbands, sons, and brothers, are giving of their heart's blood, for God and the Right.

HENRY T. DRUMGOOLE, *Chairman.*
PETER GUILDAY, *Secretary.*

QUESTIONNAIRE

THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC WAR COUNCIL

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORICAL WAR RECORDS

932 FOURTEENTH STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Administrative Committee

RT. REV. PETER J. MULDOON, D.D.
CHAIRMAN
RT. REV. JOSEPH SCHREMBS, D.D.
RT. REV. PATRICK J. HAYES, D.D.
RT. REV. WILLIAM T. RUSSELL, D.D.

NAME OF CHURCH.....
TOWN OR CITY.....
DIOCESE.....
NAME OF PASTOR.....

Committee on Historical Records of Catholic War Activities

RT. REV. MONSIGNOR H. T. DRUMGOOLE, D. D., LL.D.
CHAIRMAN
REV. PETER GUILDAY, PH.D.
SECRETARY

NOTE—*Please Have Typewritten if Possible. If not Sufficient Space for Names, Please send for Additional Blanks or use Paper of same Dimensions.*

NAME FAMILY	NAME CHRISTIAN	AGE	HOME ADDRESS	BRANCH OF SERVICE ARMY OR NAVY	REG., RANK, ETC.	NAME AND ADDRESS OF NEAREST RELATIVE

The formation of Diocesan War Councils has not lagged behind the progress of the National War Council, and in many dioceses there has been formed a Committee on Historical Records which will act in conjunction with the central body at Washington. As an example of the work to be done, the following letter sent out by His Eminence Cardinal Farley, of New York, is worthy of preservation in these pages:

Cardinal's Residence

452 Madison Avenue

Rev. and Dear Father:

The National Catholic War Council in a circular addressed to the American Hierarchy has urged the importance of collecting and preserving accurate and complete statistics of Catholic participation in the war. This suggestion has my fullest and most cordial approval, and now that the first year has ended, I write to request your co-operation in the compilation of these statistics.

It is unnecessary to expatiate upon the value which such information, carefully prepared, will have for the Catholic apologist and historian of the future. I appeal, however, to your pride as a priest, and as a member of the archdiocesan clergy, to interest yourself seriously in the collection of war statistics for the Archdiocese of New York. After careful consideration of the problem, I have decided to ask each pastor to file in the Chancery Office a *Parish War Record for* 1917, which request will be repeated annually until the close of hostilities.

To insure order and uniformity in this very important matter, I would suggest that your report be typewritten on legal cap, bound, and properly inscribed in the manner legal documents are prepared. The information required can be grouped under the following general headings and sub-titles:

1. *THE HONOR ROLL OF THE PARISH.*

This should contain the names and addresses of all the young men of the parish in the Army and Navy, and should show their rank, branch of service, and the unit to which they have been assigned. For example:

Jones, John J. 24 *East* 52*d St.* *Private.* 306 *Inf. U. S. N. A.*

The list, of course, should be arranged alphabetically. The names of Catholic young women serving as nurses in military hospitals should also be included in the honor roll. Under this heading we have the most important data, which in many cases the pastors have already prepared.

2. *CO-OPERATION WITH FEDERAL, STATE AND MUNICIPAL WAR MEASURES.*

Under this heading should be included a statement of what the clergy and people of the parish did to assist:

(*a*) *The New York State Military Census.*
(*Cf.* My circular of May 7, 1917.)

(*b*) *The Federal Draft Census.*
(*Cf.* My Circular of May 31, 1917.)

(*c*) *The Food Conservation Campaign.*
(*Cf.* My circular of June 28, 1917.)

(*d*) *The Liberty Loan Campaigns and the War Savings Campaign.*
(Such information as you can gather regarding membership of parishioners on campaign committees, and the purchase of Bonds and Savings Certificates and Stamps by members of your parish.)

(*e*) *Recruiting Campaigns.*
(Meetings held in parish halls, addresses by Clergy and members of the parish.)

(*f*) *Patriotic Church Services.*
(Special reference to the announcement of the declaration of war in

circular of April 12, 1917, and to the observance of Prayer Sunday as asked in circular of October 24th.)

3. *CO-OPERATION WITH THE AMERICAN RED CROSS.*.

(*a*) *The Red Cross Campaign for Funds.*
(*Cf.* Circular of June 22, 1917. The amount contributed, names of Catholic workers on the local committees, and the names of Catholics contributing large amounts.)

(*b*) *Branches of the Red Cross.*
(Parish branch, its meetings, its service. Local branches in which Catholic men or women are prominent workers, officials, etc.)

(*c*) *The Red Cross Membership Drive.*
(*Cf.* Circular recently sent you by Red Cross. Activity of clergy and Catholics in support of this drive and the results obtained in your parish.)

4. *CO-OPERATION WITH CATHOLIC WAR MOVEMENTS.*

(*a*) *The Knights of Columbus War Camp Activities.*
(*Cf.* Announcement in "Open Letter to New York Catholics," dated July 16, 1917, sent you with a letter to the "Priests of Manhattan and the Bronx," dated July 18, 1917. What aid did the parish give the K. of C. for their campaign July 22 to July 29th in workers and in money?)
Other Assistance to the Knights in their work.

(*b*) *National Catholic War Council.*

(*c*) *The League of Catholic Women.*
(*Cf.* Recommendation sent you under date of November 28, 1917.)

(*d*) *The Chaplains' Aid Society.*

5. *PARISH STATISTICS NOT INCLUDED IN PRECEDING HEADINGS.*

I believe the headings mentioned cover our activities quite thoroughly. To gather this information will require considerable labor, but the importance of the subject justifies my request, and I feel it will meet with your earnest support. The *Parish War Record* should be typewritten in duplicate, one copy to be preserved in the parish records and the other sent to the Chancery Office. I shall expect all records to be filed by the fifteenth of March.

I take this opportunity to commend the pastors of the archdiocese for their ready and enthusiastic support of all patriotic movements, and I confidently expect that as the war progresses their interest will increase. The flower of our Catholic youth is in the ranks; may God preserve its bloom and fragrance for the future of the Church in our wonderful land!

Praying for you every blessing, I am,

Faithfully yours in Christ,
JOHN CARDINAL FARLEY,
Archbishop of New York.

A Handbook of the National Catholic War Council is now being prepared, and before very long Committies of Historical Records will exist in every Catholic centre of the United States. No one can overestimate the value such an organzation will have in arousing a nation-wide interest in Catholic history, both past, present and future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE "CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA" DIOCESAN BIBLIOGRAPHY

There exists no complete bibliography of the Catholic Church in the United States. The only work published thus far that approaches the problem is Finotti's *Bibilographia Catholica Americana*. Finotti's work, however, is not a technical one. It is a list of books written and published by Catholic authors in the United States, and it covers only the years 1789 to 1820. What is needed is a volume similar to that published by Professors Channing, Hart, and Turner: *Guide to the Study of American History*. They have selected from the immense mass of rich material on American History all that is likely to be most immediately useful to the searcher in political, social, constitutional, and economic American History.

A *Bibliography of American Catholic History* is the work of a lifetime. It can hardly be done by any one scholar or student. Help must be asked from the thousands of American Catholics who are interested in such a study; and help must come especially from the clergy.

It is only after long deliberation that a plan has been decided upon for starting this much-needed work. We begin by publishing the bibliographies to be found at the end of all the articles in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* which treat of the Dioceses and Archdioceses of the United States. Copies of these pages will then be sent to all who are known to be students of American Church History, with the request that books be added. From time to time these completed lists will be reprinted in the REVIEW, and all those who assist in the work will be given credit for the same. For the present, the usual divisions of *Sources* and *Books* must be abandoned, and the final classification will be postponed until it is concluded that the lists as published are as exhaustive as possible. The scheme to be followed will be chronological, that is, the fourteen Provinces will be taken up in the order of their erection and under each Province or Archdiocese the Suffragan Bishoprics *as they are at present* will be placed, again in the order of their erection.

Through the courtesy of the Editors of the *Catholic Encyclopedia* we are permitted to use their volumes for these purposes.

I. PROVINCE OF BALTIMORE (1808)

1. Baltimore (1789).

SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in Colonial Days* (New York, York, 1886); ID., *Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll* (New York, 1888); ID., *Hist. of the Cath. Church in the United States*, 1844–68 (2 vols., New York, 1892); Catholic Almanacs and Directories, 1834–1907; O'GORMAN, *The Roman Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1895); DAVIS, *Day-Star of American Freedom;* SCHARF, *Hist. of Maryland* (Baltimore, 1879); MCSHERRY, *History of Maryland* (Baltimore, 1852); SCHARF, *History of Baltimore City and County* (Philadelphia, 1881); TREACY, *Old Catholic Maryland* (Swedesboro, N. J., 1879); KNOTT, *History of Maryland* (Baltimore, s. d.); STANTON, *History of the Church in Western Mary-*

land (Baltimore, 1900); RIORDAN, ed., *Cathedral Records* (Baltimore, 1906); Archives of Maryland Hist. Society (Baltimore); Diocesan Archives (ibid.); HUGHES, *Hist. of S. J. in N. Am.* (Cleveland, 1907); *Acta et Decreta S. Conc. Recentiorum. Collectio Lacensis. Auctoribus Presbyt. S. J.* (Frieburg, 1875), contains in vol. III, the full text of the decrees of these ten councils; *Concilia Provincialia Baltimori Habita ab Anno*, 1829 *ad* 1849 (Baltimore, 1851), gives the acts of only the first seven provincial councils.

2. Richmond (1820)

MAGRI, *The Catholic Church in the City and Diocese of Richmond* (Richmond, Virginia, 1906); PARKE, *Catholic Missions in Virginia* (Richmond, 1850); KEILEY, *Memoranda* (Norfolk, Virginia, 1874); *Proceedings of the Catholic Benevolent Union* (Norfolk, 1875); *The Metropolitan Catholic Almanac* (Baltimore, 1841–61); *Catholic Almanac and Directory* (New York, 1865–95); *Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee, 1895–9); *Official Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee, 1900–11); HUGHES, *The History of the Society of Jesus in North America, Colonial and Federal* (London, 1907); SHEA, *The History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (Akron, Ohio, 1890); foreign references cited by SHEA (I, bk. II, i, 106 107, 149, 150); NAVARETTE, *Real Cédula que contiene el ariento capitulado con Lucas Vásquez de Ayllón; Coleccion de Viages y Descubrimientos* (Madrid, 1829), ii, 153, 156; FERNANDEZ, *Historia Eclesiastica de Nuestros Tiempos* (Toledo, 1611); QUIROS, *Letter of 12 Sept., 1570*; ROGEL, *Letter of 9 Dec., 1520*; BARCIA, *Ensayo Cronológico*, 142–6; TANNER *Societas Militaris*, 447–51.

3. Charleston (1820).

SHEA, *Hist. of Cath. Ch. in U. S.* (New York, 1889–92); O'GORMAN, *Hist. of the Cath. Ch. in the U. S.* (New York, 1895), passim; *The United States Catholic Miscellany*, files (Charleston, 1822–1862).

4. Wheeling (1850).

None given.

5. Savannah (1850).

SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the U. S.*, IV (New York, 1892), passim.

6. Wilmington, Del. (1868).

Archives of the Diocese of Wilmington; Archives of the Maryland Province, S. J.; JOHNSTONE, *Hist. of Cecil Co., Md.* (Elkton, Md., 1881); CONRAD, *Hist. of Delaware* (Wilmington, 1908).

7. St. Augustine (1857–1870).[1]

Nine given.

8. Vicariate Apostolic of North Carolina (1868).

None given.

II. PROVINCE OF OREGON CITY (1846)

1. Oregon City (1843).

BLANCHET, *Historical Sketches* (Portland, 1870); *The Catholic Sentinel* (Portland, 1870-1910), files; *Catholic Directory; Diocesan Archives.*

[1] Established as the Vicariate Apostolic of Florida in 1857.

2. Seattle (1846–1850–1907).[2]

DE SMET, *Western Missions and Missionaries* (New York, 1859); IDEM, *Oregon, Missions and Travels over the Rocky Mountains* (New York, 1847); PALLADINO, *Indian and White* (Baltimore, 1894); BLANCHET, *Historical Sketches of the Catholic Church in Oregon* (Portland, 1878); SNOWDEN, *History of Washington* (New York, 1909); COSTELLO, *The Siwash* (Seattle, 1895).

3. Helena (1868–1884).[3]

Catholic Directory, 1909; *Catholic News* (New York), files; *Biog. Encycl. Cath. Hierarchy U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898).

4. Boise (1868–1893).[4]

VAN DER DONCKT, *The Founders of the Church in Idaho* in the *Eccles. Review*, XXXII, Nos. 1, 2, 3; SHEA, *Hist. Cath. Ch. in U. S.* (New York 1894); REUSS, *Biographical Encycl. of the Cath. Hierarchy* (Milwaukee, Wisconsin).

5. Alaska (1894).

United States Bureau of American Republic, Handbook, 1884; *Alaska; Archives of the Prefecture Apostolic of Alaska;* DEVINE, *Across Wildest America* (Montreal, 1905). Also GIBBS, DALL, NELSON, HOLMBERG, with PETROFF, NAVY, and other Russian writers.

6. Baker City (1903).

Catholic Sentinel (Portland, August, 1903) files; *The Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee, 1907).

7. Great Falls (1904).

PALLADINO, *Indian and White in the Northwest* (Baltimore, 1894); *The Iowa Catholic Messenger* (Davenport, Iowa, 1904); WILTZIUS, *The Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee, 1908).

8. Spokane (1913).

None given.

III. PROVINCE OF ST. LOUIS (1826–1847)

1. St. Louis (1826).[5]

ROSATI, *Relazione*, Letters to the Propaganda and Private Letters; IDEM, *Diocesan Archives*; SHEA, *Hist. of the Catholic Church in the U. S.*, I (Akron, 1888), passim; THORNTON, *Historical Sketch of the Church in St. Louis;* WALSH, *Jubilee Memoirs* (St. Louis, 1891); *Encycl. of the Hist St. Louis* (St. Louis, 1899); *Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee).

2. St. Joseph (1868).

HOGAN, *On the Mission in Missouri* (Kansas City, 1892); LINNENKAMP, *Historical Souvenir of the Immaculate Conception Parish* (St. Joseph, 1907); *Official Catholic Directory* (1910).

---

[2] Erected as Diocese of Walla Walla in 1846; merged into the Diocese of Nesqually in 1850; and transferred to Seattle in 1907.

[3] Erected as Vicariate of Montana in 1868, and as the Diocese of Helena in 1884.

[4] Established as the Vicariate Apostolic of Idaho in 1868, and erected into Diocese of Boise in 1893.

[5] Erected into a Diocese in 1826, and into an Archd841nioceies7.

3. Leavenworth (1851–1877).[6]

DEFOURI, *Original Diaries and Letters of Jesuit Missionaries; Catholic Directory*, 1851-1910; CLARKE, *Lives of the Deceased Bishops of the Catholic Church in the United States*, III (New York, 1888), 611 sqq.; REUSS, *Biol. Cycl. of the Catholic Hierarchy in U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898); *Western Watchman* (St. Louis, Missouri), files.

4. Kansas City, Missouri (1880).

Catholic Directory, 1881, 1910; *Church Progress; Western Watchman* (St. Louis) files; REUSS, *Biog. Cycl. of the Cath. Hierarchy of U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898).

5. Wichita (1887).

Archives of Diocese; Catholic Directory.

6. Concordia (1887).

None given.

IV. PROVINCE OF NEW ORLEANS (1793–1850)[7]

1. New Orleans (1793)

Archives of the Diocese of New Orleans; Archives of the St. Louis Cathedral; SHEA, *The Cath. Church in Colonial Days* (New York, 1886); IDEM; *Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll* (New York, 1888); IDEM, *Hist. of the Cath. Church in the U. S.*, 1808–85 (2 vols., New York, 1892); GAYARRÉ, *Hist. de la Louisiane* (2 vols., New Orleans, 1846–7); CHARLEVOIX, *Journal d'un Voyage dans l'Amérique Septentrional*, VI (Paris, 1744); DE LA HARPE, *Journal Hist. de l'Etablissement des Français à la Louisiane* (New Orleans, 1831); KING, *Sieur de Bienville* (New York 1893); DIMITRY, *Hist. of Louisiana* (New York, 1892); DUMONT, *Mémoires Histor. sur la Louisiane* (Paris, 1753); LE PAGE DU PRATZ, *Hist. de la L.* (3 vols., Paris, 1758); FORTIER, *L. Studies* (New Orleans, 1894); IDEM, *Hist. of L.* (4 vols., New York, 1894); MARTIN, *Hist. of L. from the earliest Period* (1727); KING AND FICKLEN, *Hist. of L.* (New Orleans, 1900); *Archives of the Ursuline Convent, New Orleans, Diary of Sister Madeleine Hachard* (New Orleans, 1727–65); *Letters of Sister M. H.* (1727); *Archives of Churches, Diocese of New Orleans* (1722–1909); *Le Propagateur Catholique* (New Orleans), files; *The Morning Star* (New Orleans, 1868–1909), files; *Le Moniteur de La Louisiane* (New Orleans, 1794–1803), files; French and Spanish manuscripts in archives of Louisiana Historical Society; CHAMBON, *In and Around the Old St. Louis Cathedral* (New Orleans, 1908); *The Picayune* (New Orleans, 1837–1909), files; CAMILLE DE ROCHEMENTEIX, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle France au XVIIIe Siécle* (Paris, 1906); CASTELLANOS, *New Orleans as it Was* (New Orleans, 1905); MEMBER OF THE ORDER OF MERCY, *Essays, Educational and Historic* (New York, 1899); LOWENSTEIN, *Hist. of the St. Louis Cathedral of New Orleans* (1882); MEMBER OF THE ORDER OF MERCY, *Cath. Hist. of Alabama and the Floridas; Centenaire du Pére Antoine* (New Orleans, 1885); HARDEY, *Religious of the Sacred Heart* (New York, 1910).

[6] Erected as Vicariate of Indian Territory in 1851; by 1860 known as Vicariate of Kansas, and finally established as the Diocese of Leavenworth in 1877.

[7] Erected as Diocese in 1793 and as Archdiocese in 1850. From 1801 until 1805 the Diocese was administered by Vicars-General. From 1805 to 1812, it was ruled from Baltimore. In 1812, Father Du Bourg was named Administrator and in 1815 he was consecrated Bishop of Louisiana. To this Province belongs the Diocese of Lafayette, recently erected.

2. Mobile (1825–1829).[8]

HAMILTON, *Colonial Mobile* (Boston and New York, 1897); SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (Akron, O., New York, Chicago, 1886, 1892); IDEM, *Defenders of Our Faith* (New York, Chicago, 1886, 1893); MOTHER AUSTIN, *A Catholic History of Alabama and the Floridas*, I (New York, 1908); *Metropolitan Catholic Almanac and Laity's Directory* (Baltimore, 1850 sqq.); *Official Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee, New York, 1910); REGER, *Die Benedictiner im Staate Alabama* (Baltimore, 1898).

3. Natchez (1837).

Catholic Directory (1910); SHEA, *Defenders of our Faith;* DE COURCY AND SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the U. S.*

4. Little Rock (1843).

GAYARRÉ, *French Domination* (New Orleans, 1845); IDEM, *Spanish Domination* (New Orleans, 1845); IDEM, *American Domination* (New Orleans, 1845); POPE, *A Tour of the United States* (Richmond, 1792); GREENHOW, *History of Oregon and California* (Boston, 1845); MELISH, *Military and Topographical Atlas* (Philadelphia, 1815); NUTTAL, *Travels in Arkansas* (Philadelphia, 1821); POPE, *Early Days in Arkansas* (Little Rock, 1895); WASHBURN, *Reminiscences of the Indians* (Richmond, 1869); PARKMAN, works; BANCROFT, *History of the United States* (Boston, 1879); REYNOLDS, *Makers of Arkansas History* (New York and Boston, 1905); HEMSTEAD, *School History of Arkansas* (New Orleans, 1889) SHINN, *School History of Arkansas* (Richmond, 1900); ROZIER, *History of the Mississippi Valley* (St. Louis, 1890); JEWELL, *History of the Methodist Church in Arkansas* (Little Rock, 1898); *Publications of the Arkansas Historical Association*, I, II (Little Rock, 1908); HALLIBURTON, *History of Arkansas County, Arkansas* (Dewitt, 1909); SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church* (New York, 1892).

5. Galveston (1841–1847).[9]

SHEA, *History of Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1894); IDEM, *Hist. Cath. Missions* (New York, 1855); REUSS, *Biog. Cycl. Cath. Hierarchy of United States* (Milwaukee, 1898); *Catholic Directory*, 1909; *Freeman's Journal* (New York), *Morning Star* (New Orleans, June, 1870), files.

6. Alexandria, La. (1853–1910).[10]

MARTIN, *History of Louisiana* (New Orleans, 1882); SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, I; CLARKE, *Lives of the Deceased Bishops* (New York, 1888); and the unpublished letters of Bishop Martin.

7. San Antonio (1874).

History of the Catholic Church in the Diocese of San Antonio (San Antonio, 1897); *Diocesan Archives* (unpublished); *Southern Messenger* (San Antonio), files, November, 1894; October, 1895; March, April, 1910; March, 1911.

---

[8] Established as Vicariate of Alabama-Florida in 1825, and as a Diocese in 1829.

[9] Erected as Vicariate-Apostolic of Texas in 1841 and as a Diocese in 1847.

[10] Erected in 1853 as Diocese of Natchitoches; transferred to Alexandria in 1910.

8. Corpus Christi (1874–1912)

None given.

9. Dallas (1890).

Catholic Directory (1908); REUSS, *Biog. Cycl. of the Cath. Hierarchy of the U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898).

10. Oklahoma (1876–1891–1905).[11]

HILL, *A History of the State of Oklahoma* (Chicago, 1908); ROCH, *History of Oklahoma* (Wichita, 1890); TINDALL, *Makers of Oklahoma* (Guthrie, 1905); THOBURN AND HOLCOMB, *A History of Oklahoma* (San Francisco, 1908); *The Oklahoma Annual Almanac and Industrial Record* (Oklahoma City, 1909).

V. PROVINCE OF NEW YORK (1808–1850)[12]

1. New York (1808).

SHEA, *Hist. of Cath. Ch. in U. S.* (New York, 1886); IDEM, *Cath. Churches of N. Y.* (New York, 1878); *Ecclesiastical Records, State of New York* (Albany, 1902); O'CALLAGHAN, *Documentary Hist. of New York* (Albany, 1849-51); BAYLEY, *Brief Sketch of the Early Hist., Cath. Ch. on the Island of New York* (New York, 1854); FINOTTI, *Bibliographia Catholica Americana* (New York, 1872); FLYNN, *The Cath. Ch. in New Jersey* (Morristown, 1904); WHITE, *Life of Mrs. Eliza A. Seton* (New York, 1893); CLARKE, *Lives of the Deceased Bishops, U. S.* (New York, 1872-86); SETON, *Memoir, Letters and Journal of Elizabeth Seton* (New York, 1869); FARLEY, *History of St. Patrick's Cathedral* (New York, 1908); SMITH, *Hist. Cath. Ch. in New York* (New York, 1905); REUSS, *Biog. Cycl., Cath. Hierarchy, U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898); *The Catholic Directory;* U. S. CATH. HIST. SOCIETY, *Historical Records and Studies* (New York, 1899-1910); *Memorial, Most Rev. M. A. Corrigan* (New York, 1902); HASSARD, *Life of the Most Rev. John Hughes* (New York, 1866); BRANN, *Most Rev. John Hughes* (New York, 1892); CAMPBELL, *Pioneer Priests of North America* (New York, 1909-10); *Mary Aloysia Hardey* (New York, 1910); *New York Truth Teller,* files; *Freeman's Journal,* files; *Metropolitan Record,* files; *Tablet,* files; *Catholic News,* files; BROWNSON, H. F., *Brownson's Early, Middle and Later Life* (Detroit, 1898-1900); BENNETT, *Catholic Footsteps in Old New York* (New York, 1909); ZWIERLEIN, *Religion in New Netherland* (Rochester, 1910).

2. Albany (1847).

BRODHEAD, *History of the State of New York* (New York, 1853-71); MARTIN, *Life of Father Jogues* (English tr., New York, 1896); *Dongan Reports* in Vol. iii of *Documents relating to the Colonial History of New York* (Albany, 1853); O'CALLAGHAN, *Documentary History of the State of New York* (Albany, 1849-51); FOLEY, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus* (London, 1877-83); JOHN GILMARY SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1886-92); HOWELL-TENNEY, *History of Albany and Schenectady Counties* (New York, 1886); WEISE, *Troy's One Hundred Years* (Troy, 1891); *Albany Argus,* 26 Jan., 1813; O'CALLAGHAN, *History of New Netherland* (New York, 1846-48).

[11] Erected as a Prefecture-Apostolic in 1876, as a Vicariate in 1891, and as a Diocese in 1905.

[12] Erected as Diocese in 1808, and as an Archdiocese in 1850.

3. Buffalo (1847).

BAYLEY, *History of the Church in New York* (New York, 1870); TIMON, *Missions in Western New York* (Buffalo, 1862); DONOHUE, *History of the Catholic Church in Western New York* (Buffalo, 1904); IDEM, *The Iroquois and the Jesuits* (Buffalo, 1895); *Relations des Jésuites* (Quebec, 1858); MARGRY, *Découvertes* (Paris, 1893); HENNEPIN, *Nouvelle Découverte* (Utrecht, 1678); CRONIN, *Life and Times of Bishop Ryan* (Buffalo, 1893); *The Historical Writings of the late Orsamus H. Marshall* (Albany, 1887); *The Sentinel*, files (Buffalo); Maps by GENERAL JAMES CLARKE (Auburn); Bishop Timon's diary and unpublished letters.

4. Brooklyn (1853).

MITCHELL, *Golden Jubilee of Bishop Loughlin* (Brooklyn, 1891); STILES, *History of Brooklyn* (Brooklyn, 1867); (1870); *The Eagle and Brooklyn* (Brooklyn, 1893); *U. S. Cath. Historical Magazine* (New York, 1890-91); *U. S. Cath. Hist. Soc. Hist. Records* (New York, 1900); ii, pt. I; SHEA, *Hist. Cath. Church in U. S.* (New York, 1894); MULRENAN, *A Brief Sketch of the Cath. Church in Long Island* (New York, 1871); O'CALLAGHAN, *Hist. New Netherlands* (New York, 1846-48); *Long Island Star*, files (Brooklyn, 1822, 1823, 1825).

5. Newark (1853).

FLYNN, *The Catholic Church in New Jersey* (Morristown, 1904); SHEA, *History of the Cath. Ch. in the U. S.* (New York, 1889-92); REUSS, *Biog. Cycl. of the Cath. Hierarchy in the U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898); BAYLEY, *A Brief Sketch of the Early Hist. of the Cath. Ch. on the Island of New York* (New York, 1853); GRIFFIN, *Catholics in the Am. Revolution*, I (Ridley Park, Pa., 1907); TANGUAY, *Documents relating to the Colonial History of New Jersey* (Newark, 1880); *History Cath. Ch. in Paterson, N. J.* (Paterson, 1883); *Hist. City of Elizabeth* (Elizabeth, 1899); *Freeman's Journal* and *Truth Teller* (New York) files; *The Catholic Directory* (1850-1910).

6. Rochester (1868).

Conc. Balt. Plen. II acta et decreta; Acta S. Sedis, III; Leonis XIII Acta xvi, xxi; Catholic Directory (1868-1911); MCQUADE: *Diaries* (fragmentary); IDEM, *Pastorals* in *Annual Coll. for Eccl. Students* (1871-1911); IDEM, *Pastoral* (Jubilee) (1875); IDEM, *Pastoral* (Visitation) (1878); IDEM, *Our Amerian Seminaries* in *Am. Eccl. Rev.* (May, 1897), reprint in SMITH, *The Training of a Priest*, pp. xxi-xxxix; IDEM, *The Training of a Seminary Professor* in SMITH, *op. cit.*, pp. 327-335; IDEM, *Christian Free Schools* (1892), a reprint of lectures; IDEM, *Religion in Schools* in *North Am. Rev.* (April, 1881); IDEM, *Religious Teaching in Schools* in *Forum* (December, 1889); *Reports of Conferences held by parochial teachers* (1904-10).

7. Ogdensburg (1872).

SHEA, *History of Cath. Church in United States* (New York, 1894——); WALWORTH, *Reminiscences of Bishop Wadhams* (New York, 1893); SMITH, *Hist. of Dioc. of Ogdensburg* (New York, 1885); *Illus. Hist. of Cath. Church in America*, ed. BEGNI (New York, 1910); CURTIS, *St. Lawrence County* (Syracuse, 1894).

8. Trenton (1881).

FLYNN, *The Catholic Church in New Jersey* (Morristown, 1904); LEAHY, *The Diocese of Trenton* (Princeton, 1907); MCFAUL, *Memorial of the Rt. Rev. Michael J. O'Farrell;* FOX, *A Century of Catholicity in Trenton, N. J.; The Catholic Directory* (1852, 1882, 1911).

9. Syracuse (1886).

MARTIN, *Life of Father Jogues* (New York, 1896); DONGAN, *Reports* in *Documents relating to the Colonial History of New York City,* III (Albany, 1853); ed. THWAITES, *Jesuit Relations* (Cleveland, 1896-1901); O'CALLAGHAN, *Documentary History of the State of New York* (Albany, 1849-51); SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1886-92); DONOHUE, *The Iroquois and the Jesuits* (Buffalo, 1895); BRUCE, *Memorial History of the City of Syracuse* (Syracuse, 1891); BANNON, *Pioneer Irish of Onondaga* (Syracuse, 1911); COOKINHAM, *History of Oneida County* (Utica, 1912); BUGG, *Memoirs of Utica* (Utica, 1884); CAMPBELL, *Pioneer Priests of North America* (New York, 1908); HEWITT, *History of the Diocese of Syracuse* (Syracuse, 1903); LYNCH, *A Page of Church History in New York* (Utica, 1903); *U. S. Cath. Hist. Society, Historical Records and Studies* (New York, April, 1909-February, 1911); FARLEY, *History of St. Patrick's Cathedral* (New York, 1908); ZWIERLEIN, *Religion in New Netherlands* (Rochester, 1910); BAYLEY, *A Brief Sketch of the Early History of the Catholic Church in the Island of New York* (New York, 1870); GRIFFIS, *The Story of New Netherland* (New York, 1909); DIEFENDOFF, *The Historic Mohawk* (New York, 1910).

VI. PROVINCE OF CINCINNATI (1821–1850)[13]

1. Cincinnati (1821).

SHEA, *Hist. Cath. Church in the United States* (New York, 1889-1892); O'GORMAN, *Roman Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1895); KELLY and KIRWIN, *History of Mt. St. Mary's Seminary of the West* (Cincinnati, 1894); HOUCK, *A History of Catholicity in Northern Ohio* (Cleveland, 1902); *The Catholic Telegraph* (Cincinnati) files; REUSS, *Bib. Cycl. of the Cath. Hierarchy of the U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898); *Catholic Directory* (1908).

2. Louisville (1808–1841).[14]

M. J. SPALDING, *Life, Times and Character of Benedict Joseph Flaget* (Louisville, 1852); IDEM, *Sketches of the Early Catholic Missions in Kentucky,* 1787-1827 (Louisville, 1846); SHEA, *History of Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1886-93); J. L. SPALDING, *Life of Archbishop Spalding* (New York, 1873); WEBB, *Centenary of Catholicity in Kentucky* (Louisville, 1884); DEPPEN, *Louisville Guide* (Louisville, 1887); *Catholic Orphan's Souvenir* (Louisville, 1901); files of *Catholic Advocate, Catholic Guardian* and *Catholic Record.*

3. Detroit (1833).

SHEA, *History of Cath. Missions among the Indian Tribes of U. S.* (New York, 1855); IDEM, *Life and Times of Most Rev. John Carroll* (New York, 1888); IDEM, *History of Cath. Ch. in U. S.* (New York,

[13] Erected into a Diocese in 1821 and into an Archdiocese in 1850.

[14] Erected as Diocese of Bardstown in 1808 and transferred to Louisville in 1841.

1904); CAMPBELL, *Pioneer Priests of North America* (New York, 1908); U. S. Cath. Hist. Soc., *Hist. Records and Studies* (New York, November, 1907); v. Pt. i; REUSS, *Biog. Cycl. of the Catholic Hierarchy of U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1889); CLARKE, *Lives of Deceased Bishops* (New York, 1872); *Catholic Directory* (1908); COOLEY, *Michigan: A History of Governments* (Boston, 1885); MCLAUGHLIN, *History of Education in Michigan* (Washington, 1891).

4. Indianapolis (1834–1898).[15]

ALERDING, *Hist. of Cath. Ch. in the Diocese of Vincennes* (Indianapolis, 1883); BAYLEY, *Memoirs of the Right Rev. Simon Wm. Bruté* (New York, 1860-1873); LYONS, *Silver Jubilee of University of Notre Dame* (Chicago, 1869); SHEA, *Hist. of Cath. Ch. in U. S.* (New York, 1890), III, IV; CLARKE, *Lives of Deceased Bishops of U. S.* (New York, 1872); *Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee, 1909); *Catholic Telegraph* (Cincinnati), contemporary files.

5. Nashville (1837).

None given.

6. Cleveland (1847).

SHEA, *Catholic Missions* (New York, 1854), 293, and in *Catholic Universe* (Cleveland, 13 September, 1881); IDEM, *Hist. of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1889, 1892); *Leben u. Wirken des hochw. Franz Sales Brunner, C.PP.S.; The Catholic Miscellany* (Charleston, S. C., 1824-30); *The Catholic Telegraph* (Cincinnati, 1831-47); HOUCK, *A History of Catholicity in Northern Ohio and Diocese of Cleveland* (Cleveland, 1902); IDEM, *The Church in Northern Ohio* (Cleveland, 1889); *Reminiscences of the Right Rev. P. J. Machebeuf* in *The Catholic Universe* (18 October, 1883, and 31 January, 1889); *Reminiscences of the Right Rev. Louis de Goesbriand* in *The Catholic Universe* (27 December, 1888).

7. Covington (1853).

MAES, *Life of Rev. Charles Nerinckx* (Cincinnati, 1880); IDEM, *Golden Jubilee of the Diocese of Covington* (Pastoral Letter, November, 1903); WEBB, *The Centenary of Catholicity in Kentucky* (Louisville, 1884); SPALDING, *Life of Benedict Joseph Flaget* (Louisville, 1852); IDEM, *Sketches of Early Cath. Missions in Kentucky* (Louisville, 1844).

8. Fort Wayne (1857).

ALERDING, *The Diocese of Fort Wayne* (Fort Wayne, 1907); *The Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee, Wisconsin).

9. Columbus (1868).

HOWE, *Historical Collections of Ohio* (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1900); *American Catholic Historical Researches* (Philadelphia, July, 1896); files of *Catholic Telegraph* (Cincinnati), and *Catholic Columbian* (Columbus); *U. S. Catholic Magazine* (Baltimore, January, 1847), *The Catholic Church in Ohio.*

10. Grand Rapids (1882).

Catholic Directory (Milwaukee, 1909); REUSS, *Biog. Cycl. Cath. Hierarchy of United States* (Milwaukee, 1898); *Michigan Catholic* (Detroit), files.

[15] Erected into the Diocese of Vincennes in 1834 and transferred to Indianapolis in 1898.

11. Toledo (1910).

PARKMAN, *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West* (Boston, 1899), xi, 151; IDEM, *Conspiracy of Pontiac*, I, v, 162; xiii, 281; II, xxxi, 317; SHEA, *Cath. Church in the United States* (New York, 1886); I, 631; II (1888), 387, 474 sqq.; *Jesuit Relations* (Cleveland, 1900), LXIX, 191; SCRIBNER, *Memoirs* (Western Historical Association, Madison, Wis., 1910); HOUCK, *Catholic Church in Northern Ohio*, I (Cleveland, 1903), 1 sqq.; *United States Catholic Historical Magazine*, IV, xiii, 22; *United States Catholic Magazine* (March, 1848), 155; *Diocesan Reports* (Cleveland and Toledo, 1911); parish records: *St. Antoine de la Rivière aux Raisins; St. Francis de Sales, Toledo; St. Mary's, Tiffin, Ohio.*

(*To be continued*)

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here does not preclude extended notice in later issues of the* REVIEW)

ANDREWS MATTHEW PAGE. *A Heritage of Freedom or the Political Ideas of the English-Speaking People.* New York: G. H. Doran, 1918. Pp. xiii+110.

AUDET, FRANCIS J. *Canadian Historical Dates and Events, 1492–1915.* Ottawa: G. Beauregard, 1917. Pp. 239.

BRUNOWE, MARION J. *College of Mt. St. Vincent: A Famous Convent School.* Kenedy & Sons. Pp. ix+205.

CROSS, GEORGE. *What is Christianity? A Study of Rival Interpretations.* Chicago: University Press, 1918. Pp. x+214.

CROSS IRA B., PH.D. *Collective Bargaining and Trade Agreements.* Berkeley: University Press, 1918. Pp. 234–364.

CURTIS, EUGENE NEWTON, PH.D. *The French Assembly of 1848 and American Constitutional Doctrines.* New York: Columbia University, 1918. Pp. 357, Vol. lxxix, No. 2.

DESMOND, HUMPHREY J., LL.D. *Why God Loves the Irish.* New York: The Devin-Adair Co., 1918. Pp. xvii+108.

ECKFELDT, JOHN W., M.D. *Cobb's Creek in the Days of the Old Powder Mill.* Philadelphia, 1917. Pp. 104.

ESTCOURT, ROWLAND, PH.D. *The Conflict of Tax Laws.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1918. Pp. 116–231.

FARLEY, JOHN CARDINAL. *The Life of John Cardinal McCloskey.* New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1918. Pp. xiii+401.

GRANT, A. J. *A History of Europe.* New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1917. Pp. xiv+778.

GREENFIELD, KENT ROBERTS, PH.D. *Sumptuary Law in Nurnberg.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1918. Pp. 139.

HARING, CLARENCE HENRY, PH.D. *Trade and Navigation Between Spain and the Indies.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918.

HART, ALBERT BUSHNELL, LL.D. *New American History.* New York: American Book Co., 1917. Pp. lii+650.

HOWELL, ROGER, PH.D. *The Privileges and Immunities of State Citizenship.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1918. Pp. 117.

HUGH, DOROTHY, M. A. Edited by, preface by A. F. Pollard, M.A., Litt.D. *Illustrations of Chaucer's England.* New York: Longmans, Green & Co. Pp. xiv+302.

LABAUCHE, REV. L., S.S. *God and Man. Lectures on Dogmatic Theology.* Vol. I, God. New York: Kenedy & Sons, 1917. Pp. xvi+376.

LEE, JAMES MELVIN. *A History of American Journalism.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1917. Pp. x+462.

LEONARD, LEWIS A. *Life of Charles Carroll of Carrollton.* New York: Moffat, Yard & Co., 1918. Pp. 313.

LEVINS, ANNA FRANCES. *Some Irish Aphorisms.* New York: Levins Press, 1915.

MCCONNELL, JOHN PRESTON. *Negroes and their Treatment in Virginia, 1865–1867.* Pulaski, Va.: 1910. Pp. 126.

MCMASTER, JOHN BACH. *The Life and Times of Stephen Girard.* Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1918. Vol. i, pp. viii+469; Vol. ii, pp. 480.

MAHON, SHIELA. *Irish Joy Stories.* Mahon Press: New York, 1918. Pp. 108.

MORAN, THOMAS FRANCIS, PH.D. *American Presidents: Their Individualities and their Contributions to American Progress.* New York: T. Y. Crowell Co., 1917. Pp. 148.

PAGE, RALPH W. *Dramatic Movements in American Diplomacy.* New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1918. Pp. ix+284.

PAPI, HECTOR, S.J. *Religious Profession.* New York: Kenedy & Sons, 1918. Pp. xv+87.

POWERS, H. H. *America Among the Nations.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1918. Pp. 376.

SASIA, REV. JOSEPH C., S.J. *The Future Life.* New York: Benziger Bros., 1918. Pp. 562.

SCHLESINGER, ARTHUR MEIER, PH.D. *The Colonial Merchants and The American Revolution, 1763–1776.* New York: Columbia University, 1918. Vol. lxxviii, No. 182, pp. 648.

SCHOENRICH, OTTO. *Santo Domingo: A Country with a Future.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1918. Pp. xii+418.

VALITUTTI, REV. FRANCIS. *Chronology of the Life of Christ.* New York: 1918. Pp. 60.

VERHOEFF, MARY. *The Kentucky River Navigation.* Louisville: J. P. Morton Co., 1917. Pp. 257.

WOOD, EDWIN O., LL.D. *Historic Mackinac.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1918. Vol. I. Pp. 697; Vol. II. Pp. 773.

WARD, MRS. WILFRID. *Last Lectures by Wilfrid Ward.* New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1918. Pp. lxxiv+295.

WRONG-LANGTON-WALLACE. *University of Toronto Studies: Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada.* Toronto: University of Toronto, 1917. Vol. xxi. Pp. xi+192.

The Catholic Historical Book of Philadelphia. Philadelphia, 1917.

The Succession and Cooperation Movements in S. Carolina, 1848–1852. Concord: April, 1918. Pp. 67–138.

ZABRISKIE, LUTHER K. *The Virgin Islands of the United States of America.* New York: Putnam's Sons, 1918. Pp. xvii+339.